AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THIRD SERIES—VOL. V.—(XXV).—AUGUST, 1901.—NO. 2.

CHURCH BUILDING.—X.

Decorative Painting.

OF all the means employed to heighten the effect of architecture and to add to its beauty, the easiest and most common is the application of color. It is also one of the most ancient. In the oldest monuments of Assyria and Egypt color abounds. The Greeks used it freely even in the external decoration of their temples. The Romans applied it more sparingly, and only for interior embellishment; but the Middle Ages lavished it on all manner of important structures alike,—halls, palaces, and churches. With the classic Renaissance, chiefly inspired by what remained of Roman architecture, it almost entirely disappeared from our sacred edifices. Even the first promoters of the Gothic revival were slow to welcome it back, partly because they were unaware of the extent to which it had prevailed in mediæval times; partly, also, because of the unsatisfactory character of the first attempts to revive an art that had been practically lost. But color appeals too powerfully to man's æsthetic nature to suffer anything more than a transient eclipse. In our day its claims are universally and joyfully acknowledged, the secret of handling it successfully has been gradually won back, and its application to the decoration of our churches has become practically indispensable. It is true that, as regards their exterior, with the exception of wooden structures which imperatively demand to be painted, there is little room in our climate for that manner of adornment. Yet the charm of color is by no means denied them. It may be introduced with the happiest effect by a judicious use of differently colored materials,

or again by appealing to mosaic or enamel, both being proof against every variety and variation of temperature, though not easy to harmonize with ordinary structural substances. But the real field of ornamental color is the interior, and to it we will confine ourselves exclusively in the following remarks.

I.

The decorative effect of colors, considered generally, depends upon two things—their individual beauty, and the manner in which they are combined.

All colors possess a certain element of beauty, but not all in the same degree. There is, besides, something relative in the way they affect the beholder. A given color may be more congenial to one than to another. Loud, garish tones are unpleasant to most people, but the negro loves them. Again, the faculty of combining colors in a pleasing way is a gift very unequally divided between the various races of the human family. Orientals have at all times possessed it in a high degree. Even to-day, notwithstanding its wonderful progress in every direction, Europe has still much to learn from these semi-barbarians in the decorative handling of color. Next to them, and in some sense proceeding from them, we must place the Western artists of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. In their illuminated manuscripts, in their frescoed walls and their stained glass windows, they exhibit a sense of color and a knowledge of its most subtle harmonies seldom equalled since, and never in all probability to be surpassed. Indeed, the present age has recovered something of the gift only by the assiduous study and close imitation of these productions of a period so far behind in most respects.[1] But what it may claim as peculiarly its own is a more scientific determination of all the

[1] When, fifty years ago, it was question of repainting the walls of the *Sainte Chapelle* of Paris in a way to harmonize with its incomparable stained glass windows, various attempts were made by the ablest decorators; but they were all felt to be unsatisfactory. At length, by the merest accident, a section of a later coat of paint having dropped off, revealed, fairly preserved, a portion of the decoration as it stood in the beginning. It was just what the modern artists had been trying in vain to replace. They saw it at once and proceeded without further research to copy purely and simply what the original decorator had done, doubtless without much calculation, six hundred years before.

varieties of color and of the laws which preside over their harmony. Some notion of these we propose to give here, with the assurance that the reader, especially if he have presently or prospectively before him any work of decorative painting in his church, will find it interesting and helpful.

II.

Color, as all know, is light reflected by the object upon which it falls. White or ordinary light decomposed by a prism yields the series of colors which constitute the spectrum, commonly, though somewhat arbitrarily, divided into seven distinct colors—red, orange, yellow, green, blue, indigo, violet. Whatever portion of these elementary colors the object absorbs is lost to the eye; what it reflects of them constitutes the color of the object. The primitive colors just mentioned may be reduced further to three: blue, yellow, and red; because their combination supplies all the others. Blue and yellow mixed together produce green; yellow and red give orange; red and blue make violet. The three fundamental colors, blue, yellow, and red, are called *primaries;* the other three, green, orange, and violet (or purple, as it is sometimes named) are called *secondaries.* Combinations of these latter give *tertiaries.* Thus russet is composed of orange and purple in due proportions; olive, of green and purple; citrine, of yellow with a slight admixture of green; brown, of red, yellow and black. Black, for the scientist, is the total absence of color; white, on the other hand, in appearance the most simple of all colors, is in reality the most complex, inasmuch as it contains all the elements of color combined. But for the decorator black and white are, in certain ways, equivalent to primary colors. Together with gold, they bear the name of *neutrals,* and play a considerable part in decorative painting.

It is easy to see how these different colors may be indefinitely modified and multiplied by mixing any one of them in various proportions with black, or white, or grey (a combination of both), or by combining them with one another. The diverse tints and tones and shades and hues of each color thus generated are countless. In the *ateliers* of the famous Gobelin tapestry works, of Paris, the artist has as many as fifteen thousand of them at

command; and there is room for as many more. No vocabulary can be found to designate most of them, except in a general way. The primaries and secondaries have original names; but all the others are indicated by referring them to natural objects: buff, chestnut, chocolate, slate, rose, salmon, fawn, cream, etc., etc.

III.

Such are the colors which the artist holds at his disposal; and it remains to be seen how he should apply them. His æsthetic sense, the traditions of his art, and his personal experience will naturally guide him in this matter; but, underlying them all, there are certain laws and principles which even one practically a stranger to the art may understand, and which may help him to form a correct judgment of work done or contemplated.

1. First of all, there can be little doubt as to the expediency of painting the entire interior of the immense majority of our churches. Some hesitation in this point is conceivable in presence of so much that has been written by Ruskin and others on "Truth in Architecture," and the evil of hiding the real materials of a structure under false appearances. This may be true as regards the exterior; but the common sense and the artistic sense of ages give a contrary verdict when it is question of the interior. A church built of beautiful material, such as marble or Caen stone, assuredly should not be divested of its natural charm to make room for any other. But a material rough or poor can be no more left bare in the inside of our churches than of our houses. Light colored brick artistically handled might be a possible exception; but in any other color bare brick would be positively unpleasant to the eye and be more suggestive of a railway station than of a place of worship. All interiors require something smooth, pleasant, inviting. This is secured substantially in our churches by the process of plastering, a process most important in many ways, but needing no special remarks here, because it is generally safe in the hands of the workmen and superintendent. The even, beautiful surface it produces, however pleasing in itself, is not in the tone suited to an interior, and calls for color, and lends itself admirably to its application.

2. The work of the decorator may vary from the plainest to

the most artistic kind. It may be the simple application of colors determined and prepared beforehand, a task requiring no thought and little training; or it may imply a choice between many tones and hues for the ground or general coating of color and for the designs to be drawn upon it, a choice which often requires much judgment and artistic sense.

Many things have to be taken into account:

(*a*) **The Place to be Decorated.** — There are tones and tints charming in themselves which would be entirely out of place in the decoration of a church. Even in a place of worship, the colors must be in harmony with the special purpose of the part of the building to which they are applied. The size of the portion to be decorated must also be taken into account. A small object, or a small space, such as a chapel, admits of brighter tones than may be used on larger objects in the body of the church. This is the lesson of nature herself. In a landscape, in a tree, the prevailing tones are subdued, and bright spots appear only here and there. The same feature is noticeable in the animal kingdom. Its largest specimens are of a plain, dull color, while the brightest hues are generally confined to the smallest species. And this is in harmony with the very requirements of the eye, which instinctively turns away from broad surfaces highly colored.

Again, regard must be had to the distance at which the color has to be seen: the farther it is removed from the eye, the weaker it is in tone and effect. Of this the decorator has to be constantly mindful.

Lastly, in the vertical arrangement of colors, the darker, as suggesting something more solid, should be placed underneath; medium tones in the middle; while the clearer tints, which give an impression of lightness, should be placed in the upper part of the wall as well as in the ceiling.

(*b*) **The Light.**—The manner in which the decorative painting is to be lighted plays an important part in determining the exact tone or even the very color to be selected. Regard must be had to the quantity and to the quality of the light under which the surface or object is to be seen. Its quantity depends upon the size of the openings by which it is admitted, the absence or presence of obstacles which may interfere with its free ingress, the aspect of

the opening, and its position, parallel or perpendicular, to the surface it lights up. Thus brighter tones are necessary in decorating a chapel with a northern aspect than with a southern; or a basement, almost always insufficiently lighted, compared with the church that rises above it.

The quality of the light is a factor still more important in the choice of tone and color. The light may be natural or modified by some intervening body, such as a screen, or a stained glass window; or it may be entirely artificial, such as is supplied by candles, gas, or electricity. Now a colored surface shows differently according to the kind of light that falls upon it. Thus red is much improved by gaslight; purple, on the contrary, is tarnished and spoiled by it. In its turn, red light falling on certain tones of yellow may increase their beauty; while, striking a surface painted in green, it will give it a dull, dingy look. Hence the absolute necessity of determining how a church, a chapel, a sanctuary is to be lighted before selecting and applying the decorative colors.[2]

(*c*) **The Architectural Effect.**—Color should never interfere with it; but rather help it out. Judiciously employed, color develops form. Certain colors, such as yellow, orange, green, and all lighter tints, are salient and give relief; others, such as blue and brown, are receding. The darker tones of any color hollow, as it were, what they are applied to; the lighter ones, on the contrary, make it stand out. It is easy to see how much the application of this principle will help the decorator to emphasize the forms of objects distant from the eye, and bring out distinctly the effects of light and shade where unaided by art they would remain almost unnoticed.

(*d*) **Harmony of Assortment.**—This is perhaps the most important law of all. By it chiefly is the artist guided in the choice and combination of his colors. It consists fundamentally in

[2] This accounts for the total change of decorative colors noticeable at a certain period in mediæval churches. So long as the light that fell upon the walls remained practically unaltered, simple subdued tones prevailed. But under the intense radiation of the stained glass windows introduced in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, such tones looked faded and dull. Only the strongest colors could hold their own against the new kind of light, and so the vivid hues of blue, light green, vermilion, etc., appear, and were rendered still more powerful by a profusion of gilding.

the fact that, just as in music certain sounds when heard together cause a pleasing impression, whereas others produced simultaneously jar on the ear, so are there colors which the eye rejoices to see side by side, whilst others, though separately pleasing, are when brought together positively unpleasant to look at. Furthermore, not only do harmonious colors give pleasure when seen together, but often each seems to set off the other and to improve its beauty, whereas inharmonious colors, on the contrary, sometimes positively spoil one another when placed in juxtaposition. There is no accounting scientifically for this; consequently, it is only by lengthened experimentation that decorators succeed in determining what colors, tones, or hues, may be happily associated together. Proceeding in this way they remark that among the various colors they handle, some are good-natured, as it were, associating readily with the great number, while others are, in a way, solitary and distant. Violet is a remarkable instance of the latter. It suits neither blue, nor red, nor green. In fact, it harmonizes with only very few colors; whereas gold is friendly to almost all, yellow and gray excepted, and instead of eclipsing by its brilliancy, as might be expected, it positively brightens every color or shade of color it comes near. White, it is found, agrees with and improves certain tones of all the primary and secondary colors; whereas black harmonizes with none of them. Even white does not harmonize equally with their different tones. Thus it agrees with light red or ore color, but not with dark red; with light green, but not with dark green. Orange is a beautiful color; but its contact spoils black, making it look faded or dirty; neither does it harmonize with red or with green. Not only do certain colors mutually brighten one another, but different shades of the same color produce a similar effect. The juxtaposition of black and white, as all know, makes the former look blacker, and the latter whiter. A similar effect is produced by the association of white and grey, or black and grey; the grey looks lighter beside the black, darker beside the white. If two shades of the same color are brought together, their contrast is intensified, one being made to look lighter, the other darker. The same happens when the colors are different, if one is of a lighter tint or shade than the other.

the opening, and its position, parallel or perpendicular, to the surface it lights up. Thus brighter tones are necessary in decorating a chapel with a northern aspect than with a southern; or a basement, almost always insufficiently lighted, compared with the church that rises above it.

The quality of the light is a factor still more important in the choice of tone and color. The light may be natural or modified by some intervening body, such as a screen, or a stained glass window; or it may be entirely artificial, such as is supplied by candles, gas, or electricity. Now a colored surface shows differently according to the kind of light that falls upon it. Thus red is much improved by gaslight; purple, on the contrary, is tarnished and spoiled by it. In its turn, red light falling on certain tones of yellow may increase their beauty; while, striking a surface painted in green, it will give it a dull, dingy look. Hence the absolute necessity of determining how a church, a chapel, a sanctuary is to be lighted before selecting and applying the decorative colors.[2]

(*c*) **The Architectural Effect.**—Color should never interfere with it; but rather help it out. Judiciously employed, color develops form. Certain colors, such as yellow, orange, green, and all lighter tints, are salient and give relief; others, such as blue and brown, are receding. The darker tones of any color hollow, as it were, what they are applied to; the lighter ones, on the contrary, make it stand out. It is easy to see how much the application of this principle will help the decorator to emphasize the forms of objects distant from the eye, and bring out distinctly the effects of light and shade where unaided by art they would remain almost unnoticed.

(*d*) **Harmony of Assortment.**—This is perhaps the most important law of all. By it chiefly is the artist guided in the choice and combination of his colors. It consists fundamentally in

[2] This accounts for the total change of decorative colors noticeable at a certain period in mediæval churches. So long as the light that fell upon the walls remained practically unaltered, simple subdued tones prevailed. But under the intense radiation of the stained glass windows introduced in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, such tones looked faded and dull. Only the strongest colors could hold their own against the new kind of light, and so the vivid hues of blue, light green, vermilion, etc., appear, and were rendered still more powerful by a profusion of gilding.

the fact that, just as in music certain sounds when heard together cause a pleasing impression, whereas others produced simultaneously jar on the ear, so are there colors which the eye rejoices to see side by side, whilst others, though separately pleasing, are when brought together positively unpleasant to look at. Furthermore, not only do harmonious colors give pleasure when seen together, but often each seems to set off the other and to improve its beauty, whereas inharmonious colors, on the contrary, sometimes positively spoil one another when placed in juxtaposition. There is no accounting scientifically for this; consequently, it is only by lengthened experimentation that decorators succeed in determining what colors, tones, or hues, may be happily associated together. Proceeding in this way they remark that among the various colors they handle, some are good-natured, as it were, associating readily with the great number, while others are, in a way, solitary and distant. Violet is a remarkable instance of the latter. It suits neither blue, nor red, nor green. In fact, it harmonizes with only very few colors; whereas gold is friendly to almost all, yellow and gray excepted, and instead of eclipsing by its brilliancy, as might be expected, it positively brightens every color or shade of color it comes near. White, it is found, agrees with and improves certain tones of all the primary and secondary colors; whereas black harmonizes with none of them. Even white does not harmonize equally with their different tones. Thus it agrees with light red or ore color, but not with dark red; with light green, but not with dark green. Orange is a beautiful color; but its contact spoils black, making it look faded or dirty; neither does it harmonize with red or with green. Not only do certain colors mutually brighten one another, but different shades of the same color produce a similar effect. The juxtaposition of black and white, as all know, makes the former look blacker, and the latter whiter. A similar effect is produced by the association of white and grey, or black and grey; the grey looks lighter beside the black, darker beside the white. If two shades of the same color are brought together, their contrast is intensified, one being made to look lighter, the other darker. The same happens when the colors are different, if one is of a lighter tint or shade than the other.

We have said that there is no accounting scientifically for these harmonies or oppositions, though they have all doubtless a physical basis. Something of them, however, may be explained by a physiological fact of vision, consisting in this, that every impression of color on the retina produces not only a subsequent image in its complementary, that is, with the color which combined with it would reproduce white, but also a simultaneous diffusion of that complementary color on the adjoining objects. Thus the complementary color of red being green (blue and yellow) gazing at a red object diffuses a faint hue of green over the adjacent surfaces. If the object is blue it diffuses a hue of orange (red and yellow); and so on for the other colors. It follows that to intensify any color, nothing serves so well as to place its complementary color beside it; green beside red, orange beside blue, purple or violet beside yellow, etc.

Colors which are naturally ill assorted and antipathetic may be harmonized in different ways: *First*, by their distance from the eye, the effect of which is to temper the vivacity of each color and by a physiological effect of vision to spread something of them to the adjacent surfaces. *Secondly*, by the diffusion of a fresh tint extending to both, such as comes from any form of artificial light, or even from sunshine. There is a great harmonizing power in sunshine, with the bright yellow tone it gives in broad day to all it falls upon, or with its reddish hues of evening which spread something of the same poetic tint over all the objects of nature. *Thirdly*, by interposition. It has been remarked that when certain colors which it is necessary or desirable to use are unpleasant when placed in contact, they may be reconciled by placing between them another color in positive or negative harmony with each. The new color, in such cases, plays the part, as it were, of a mutual friend bringing and keeping together those that instinctively avoid each other. Black, white, and gold are found to be the most effective for such a purpose, as well as for detaching designs from the ground upon which they are drawn. If the ornaments are painted in a color contrasting with that of the ground, they have to be edged in a lighter tone of the same color. If, as often happens, the ornament itself is in gold, then in order to make it stand out distinctly and beautifully on a colored ground it will suffice to edge it in black.

Lastly, it is found that in all decorative works something of the three fundamental colors, pure or in combination, is desirable, and that the more evenly they balance one another, the more satisfactory is the effect. This equilibrium of colors must not be understood as demanding the same quantity of each. Three parts of yellow will balance five of red and eight of blue, and corresponding equivalents may be worked out for each and all of the other colors. When, instead of being neutral, the prevailing tone is of a special definite kind, all the rest has to be accommodated to it. If this is lost sight of, the colors used will be weak, or crude and garish, and the general effect unpleasant.

IV.

These are some of the principles that underlie the decorative application of color. A knowledge of them may help in the study of the subject, and enable the observer to watch with intelligent interest the work that is being done.[3] But the artist may know nothing at all of law thus formulated. He is guided almost entirely by his experience of the work he had already seen, or done himself, or by his tastes intuitive and cultivated. When he ventures on new or unusual appliances or combinations of color he is careful to test them before carrying them out, for he knows that experience alone can ultimately determine their fitness or unfitness. How often has he to try again and again until he hits at last on the tone and colors which are in harmony with his object! When the priest who is preparing to decorate his church, or any part of it, has at his command a decorator of this kind, competent, painstaking, and conscientious, his best and safest course will be to leave him to himself, interfering only in cases of visible mistake or misapprehension. Of course he has to make him submit to financial limitations, and often the principal problem will be: what is the best that can be done for a given sum? Viewed in this light, water colors will often be as pleasing to the eye as oil colors and be two or three times cheaper. But they are much more susceptible of being altered by moisture. They are also

[3] If the student becomes interested in the subject, he will find much to help him in *The Interior Decorator*, by D. R. Hay; various works of F. Knight, and W. and G. Audsley; still more in the work of Chevreul, *The Laws of Contrast in Color*.

easily defaced by contact, and for that reason should never be thought of for the lower parts of the edifice which are much exposed to friction. If the work to be done is sufficiently important to call for advice, an architect is generally the most competent person to give it. If, for one reason or another, the priest who orders it, is left to his own judgment, it is easy to see, from what has been said, how much he has to reflect before giving directions; how much, at the same time, he has to be on his guard against unenlightened influences. Popular taste is far from being a safe guide. Instead of ministering to it, his duty is to enlighten and to elevate it, to offer to God what is best, and then to turn round and to teach others to appreciate it. Much progress has been made among us in this department within the last twenty years. In certain forms of decorative painting our artists exhibit considerable skill; some really good work has been done in our churches, and perhaps fewer things spoiled than in our public buildings. The latter occasionally exhibit, even in our great cities, a singular absence of the sense of harmony of color either in the decorator or in the architect. In cases of persistent doubt, it is better to take the safe side and wait rather than risk considerable expenditure only to reach undesirable results. This applies chiefly to the general decorative work; if applied to some secondary portion or object in the building, more or less shut off from the rest, the peril will be less, and mistakes, if they happen, will be more easily corrected.

Finally, it may not be out of place to remark that color-blindness, that is, a visual incapacity of discerning certain colors from each other, is found to be far more common than was generally supposed; and that whoever proves to be afflicted with it, though he may be perfectly competent in every other form of art, has no right to an opinion in matters of color. The same may be said of those who while discerning color from color, have no true sense of their mutual relations. They are in the same condition to judge of harmony of color as a man is to judge of harmony of sounds who has no ear for music.

J. HOGAN.

Brighton, Mass.

CHURCH FIRE UNDERWRITING.

SINCE Prometheus brought fire down to the earth, Pandora's casket with its long train of evils has never ceased to afflict the human race. The hope which, being at the bottom of the box, could not escape, transformed itself into a fire insurance. Before the establishment of regular insurance companies the only relief to the loser by fire was that which came from the voluntary contributions of sympathizing neighbors and friends, a real help as far as it went, but as a rule uncertain and inadequate. The earliest organizations for distributing the fire loss were in the nature of clubs or societies, conducted on the mutual plan of our present benefit societies.

Fire Insurance in General.—The business of fire insurance is subject to greater vicissitudes than that of other enterprises. Fire losses are indeed peculiar, and certain districts or even States may be comparatively free from fire for a period of five, ten, fifteen or even more years, and then fall a prey to a series of disastrous conflagrations. Fire insurance is regulated by statutes. It is safer to follow "the conscience of law, than the conscience of any person, no matter however wise and virtuous he may be."

Insurance companies must lay by considerable reserve funds, as they are liable to suffer from panics and other pressure coming upon them unexpectedly. Statutes compel stock companies to set aside and carry as a liability from 50 to 90 per cent. of the *pro rata* shares of the unearned premium to be charged to the contingent or reinsurance reserve.

By the terms of the usual policy, underwriters are not liable for loss or damage caused directly or indirectly by invasion, rebellion, riot, or civil or military authority. Fire insurance is here a moral factor. The reason for such exceptions is that invasion is a falling within the sphere of a *vis major;* the presence of political perils amounts to an interruption of the ordinary negotiations of trade and business; rebellion is high treason; riot is felony or misdemeanor. Although the Constitution of the United States has closed the American Janus-temple with regard to religious strife, still the anti-Catholic riots[1] of 1855 and '56 serve

[1] Cf. Maguire's *The Irish in America*, p. 466 ff.

as a *Mane Thekel Phares* to the security of Catholic property. History always repeats itself.

The totals of the annual statements of fire insurance companies doing business in this country demonstrate that fire insurance business, despite great losses, is a profitable one. Many of the companies each year add largely to their surplus out of the earning of the preceding year, and the money paid to stockholders is not the whole net profit. In nearly all standard companies the expenses of operation are on a very liberal scale. Officers who are stockholders reap a sort of double return upon their investments, which afford them lucrative employment, as well as dividends. Last year (1900) only 55 per cent. of the income of fire insurance was paid to policyholders who suffered losses by fire, and stockholders received dividends amounting to almost 5 per cent. on both capital and surplus. The brokers and agents received from 10 to 15 per cent. on all premiums.

Some extracts from Mr. George Uriel Crocker's article, which appeared in the *North American Review* several years ago, will make clear the costliness of American fire insurance. "To-day," he says, "we find that the amount of premiums paid into insurance companies is double the amount paid out by them for fire loss. . . . In the United States, $150,000,000.00 worth of property is annually destroyed by fire. If we add to this loss the cost of its distribution, we have a grand total of $300,000,000.00, or more than the average annual expense of maintaining the National Government for the past ten years. . . . A great difference in the rates of insurance is found in different parts of the world. In an address at Manchester, England, Mr. H. C. Essex, of the Lancashire Insurance Company, estimates the average rate as follows:

France	8 cents per $100	Austria	38 cents per $100
Germany	15 " " 100	Russia	61 " " 100
England	20 " " 100	United States . . .	100 " " 100
Australia	36 " " 100		

It probably is the fact that better building methods are in vogue in Europe than in this country, and that this fact has some effect upon the rates. . . . There is also the fact to be borne in mind that any company that enters the field to-day, in opposition to

present methods, must be prepared to enter a bitter warfare. All *insurance men, i. e.*, brokers and agents, will be against the company. The use of underwriters' ratings and inspections would be denied to the new company, for no one is allowed to examine these ratings unless he first agrees to adopt them." [2]

Fire Insurance in Particular.—A fire insurance policy, which usually is a contract *in praesenti* and not a mere agreement to insure at some future time, exhibits the following features: (1) A description of the location of buildings to be insured, which may be ascertained from their deeds or from a former policy. (2) The amount of insurance. (3) The duration of the risk. (4) Rate of risk. (5) Delivery of policy. The dialectics of policies rest on the maxim of La Rochefoucauld: "The virtues lose themselves in interest, as rivers are lost in the sea." Selfishness makes the insured watchful if his property is in jeopardy from other causes, while he is careless or less vigilant in protecting his property against accident of fire, where he sees no peril of loss. The physical features (representations) and moral features (warranties) of risk are carefully measured by conservative insurance companies.

One of the most important conditions of fire insurance policies is that where property is already insured and additional insurance is desired, consent thereto ought to be obtained from the prior company. Excessive insurance is a moral hazard. Insurance companies do not insure for more than the value of the property, in order to guard against the temptation to start a fire for the insurance money. A fire insurance policy is, strictly speaking, a contract of indemnity. Valuation is sometimes made in policies upon personal or chattel property of uncertain value, as books, works of art, or rare articles, for the purpose of determining the actual indemnity in case of destruction by fire. Insurers against fire generally stipulate that they may, at their option, either reinstate the property destroyed by fire or pay the amount of damage sustained, not exceeding the insured sum of the policy. The right of the creditor or mortgagee to recover payment in money is subordinate to the right of the company to rebuild or repair the premises insured.

[2] *North American Review*, "Does Fire Insurance Cost Too Much?" April, 1895. Some of the figures given by Mr. Crocker are not quite correct.

The condition of policies that "when building shall fall, except as the result of fire, the insured will not be indemnified," is directed against cheap, flimsy, and showy buildings, which are a standing danger to life and property.

Another part of the insurance contract is the fact that the insured property left vacant or unoccupied, must be, under penalty of forfeiture of contract, disclosed to the insurance company. Vacancy presumes an increased risk. Property left unguarded is considered abandoned, unproductive, or unprofitable. It affords an abode for tramps or marauders, or increases the temptation to set fire to it. Reference is, therefore, made to the uses or purposes for which the building is intended. School-houses are usually closed during vacation time, a circumstance of which underwriters are well aware.

The amount of premium to be paid depends upon the combination of the following items: (1) The structure and condition of the building; (2) its situation and surroundings; (3) the character of local fire protection.

In certain branches of insurance, as, for instance, in the insurance of church property, a departure from the regular or standard fire insurance system has been made, with the result of greatly reduced rates of church fire insurance policies. If, according to the Declaration of Independence, all men "are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights"; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, why should not ecclesiastics be eager to advance the material improvement of their churches? The relation of standard fire insurance companies to the present church fire insurance associations is that of National or State banks to private banks.

Church Fire Insurance in General.—Universal canon law has no provision relative to church fire insurance, as this business is of comparatively recent origin. Only the particular canon law mentions it. Thus the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore (n. 283) ordained that all church property be insured against destruction or damage by fire, and that the insurance be placed with responsible companies.

In the language of insurance companies, church property is the best risk in this country; and for two reasons: first, it is free

from moral hazard, the bugbear of all standard companies; and secondly, it is generally isolated and covers different sites and is even in different States, thus lessening the risks in any one place. The larger the volume of business transacted, the more profitable is the business of fire insurance. As nothing arouses insurance companies so quickly as touching their pocket-nerves, and as stock companies and all connected with them are naturally opposed to fire insurance companies whose business is confined only to church property, it is extremely difficult to launch an ecclesiastical insurance company. A large outlay of money is required to meet the attacks of standard companies taking miscellaneous business. The modern Harpagons of mammoth underwriting are governed by the iron law of *virtus post nummos.* They are allied by compacts, trusts, combines, and commissions; they hold secret meetings, and resort to measures which, although in direct violation of civil law, are deemed necessary in order to preserve their own integrity, or to kill opposition to them. Moreover, the general unfamiliarity of the clergy and laity with insurance details makes it comparatively easy for those who are, either through ignorance or natural prejudice, opposed to leaving the old-line companies, to dissuade those who would otherwise join a church fire insurance company. These church fire insurance associations have never operated in the Eastern States to any degree.

Nevertheless, there are church fire insurance companies in many States. They are operated on the mutual assessment plan; a system that has been found to work well,—when there were no fire losses. When fire losses come in rapid succession the congregations which carry insurance in these companies are called upon to pay heavy assessments, which in many cases they are unable to meet, and the "mutual" collapses or goes into the hands of a receiver. The purely mutual plan often fails to produce funds when most needed. It has never been satisfactory, as it lacks stability and permanency. Those that have been honestly and economically managed and fortunate enough to accumulate an emergency fund have generally organized themselves into stock companies. Some of our largest and best old-liners were once mutual organizations. The purpose of mutual church fire insurance is not to hoard money, but to save money for churches and

the clergy by furnishing them protection against fire, lightning, and tornado, at the actual cost and upon the easiest practicable terms of payment.

Church fire underwriting depends less on a board of managers than on some person to whom the business is specially delegated. He is responsible for the safety and prosperity of the enterprise. For such services he is entitled to a liberal salary, so as to stimulate him to his best efforts. "We mistake human nature when we expect great efforts from any man, and supply no proper motive therefor."[3]

Owing to the indifference of some rectors of churches to carry out the Church's instructions regarding insurance of church property, and on account of the uncertainty and inconvenience in dealing with different insurance agents, some of our Bishops have taken the whole insurance business of their respective dioceses into their own hands and requested competent insurance brokers to take charge of the diocesan fire insurance, stating amount to be carried in order to keep church buildings properly insured. It is obvious that to deal directly with fire insurance companies, instead of through an army of salaried agents, means a great reduction of premiums of insurance.

Church Fire Insurance in Particular.—The plan of organizing church fire insurance is neither new nor experimental. The Catholic Church in the Netherlands has a prosperous mutual company for insuring all kinds of ecclesiastical property. The system was devised by an Antwerp priest about fifty years ago, and is under the patronage of St. Donatus of the Legio Fulminatrix. Its rates are low, only 50 cents per mill. Several Prussian dioceses have statutes relative to insurance of church property and its amount, which shall not exceed two-thirds of actual cash value of city church property and be equal to one-third of the value of rural church property.[4]

[3] Albert S. Bolles, *Practical Banking*, 3d edition, p. 35.

[4] Some Protestant denominations, such as the Anglican Church, the Congregationalists, the Methodists, and the Lutherans, have been insuring their own properties for a number of years. They prefer the mutual plan. Lutherans have the Mutual Fire Insurance Association, which insures their church property under policies (Wisconsin Standard Policy) to a maximum amount of $2,000.00 upon a single risk. It has three funds: the expense, the reserve, and the loss fund. The amount of insurance against both fire and wind-storms is 6 mills per $1.00, or $6.00 per

The question of ecclesiastical fire insurance has been agitated by both bishops and heads of religious bodies for many years past. The Franciscan Fathers some years ago considered very seriously the formation of an organization for insuring their own properties. The Religious of the Sacred Heart contemplated starting a novel plan to insure their various houses in Europe as well as in this country. The Benedictine Fathers gave much thought to the matter of their own insurance. All their endeavors were fruitless.

Church insurance has been, up to the present, successful in the diocese of Indianapolis. The Mutual Church Insurance Association of the diocese of Indianapolis, organized in 1883, insures churches, presbyteries, school-houses, but not religious institutions, academies, hospitals or asylums, against loss by fire and lightning, whether fire ensues or not, to the amount of $10,000.00 on churches and $5,000.00 on other buildings. Churches must be protected by lightning-rods. The rate of annual premium is one-quarter of one per cent., whilst the premium charges of old-liners are (for five years) three-quarters of one per cent. on unexposed church (brick) buildings, 1½ per cent. on wooden dwelling-houses, and 3 per cent. on wooden school buildings in the city of Indianapolis. It saves to the churches of the diocese about $4,000.00 a year, which otherwise would have gone to the standard companies. All officers and directors are elected from the clergy, the bishop being *ex officio* president. The secretary and treasurer are salaried officers, and must give bonds. The organization is on the mutual plan, but keeps an ever-increasing reserve fund. It does not return the surplus to the policyholders, nor are rebates allowed on premiums. Its funds are invested in United States bonds, and

$1,000.00. This Association insuring risks in Wisconsin and other States has no connection with any other insurance company. The National Mutual Church Insurance Company of the Methodist Episcopal denomination is not a regular insurance company, as it has not complied with the laws of the States and submits no annual statement to the insurance commissioners. It is the successor of a bankrupt company started in Wisconsin. The present company deferred assuming any liability whatever until it had applications aggregating $300,000.00, and then it assumed up to $1,000.00 on each risk, gradually enlarging as the business grew. It is operated on the installment plan, "fixed at the lowest practicable point." A rebate, or "the policyholder's *pro rata* share of the profits on each year's business," is granted to the insured. The defunct National Church Mutual Fire Insurance of Lisbon, Iowa, sought for business in the Western and Southern States, but failed of any general patronage.

not lent or used for any outside business. The plan has never been tried on a provincial basis.

From the experience of the last decade it is manifest that had the Benedictine Fathers started a mutual association for the protection of their properties, they would have certainly met with unexpected disaster; for this Order's losses by fire in different and widely separated places during that period amounted to a quarter of a million dollars, while the premiums did not reach one-tenth of that sum. The fire losses on church property of the diocese of La Crosse during the past three years reached upwards of $30,000.00 against only $10,000.00 of premiums.

Bishop James O'Connor, of Omaha, who died in 1890, went deeply into the subject of ecclesiastical insurance. He collected statistics for the purpose of determining the wisdom, economy, and feasibility of a fire insurance organization for the protection of Catholic church property. Five years of patient industry in this work brought to light the number and amount of fire losses sustained by the Church of this country between 1870 and 1885. It was found that the insurance of church buildings was a heavy tax on nearly every congregation, and in many cases a serious burden. Some churches were uninsured; others were insured with unsafe companies, or improperly insured. Regular insurance companies seemed to have no system in their rates. In some localities premiums were very low, and in others too high, everything being dependent on local conditions and competition. Rates on exposed church property in residential portions of cities having excellent fire protection were often far higher than those on exposed church buildings in country districts with no adequate facilities for extinguishing fire. Recognizing that a mutual assessment scheme was unsafe on account of individual liability, the good Bishop prohibited this system of insurance on the church property of his diocese. In 1889 he promoted the Catholic Mutual Relief Society of America, which was incorporated under the laws of the State of Nebraska, March 28, 1896. Its purpose was to centralize the insurance of church property in one common fund, and to furnish safe indemnity in case of loss. It was a measure of self-defence taken to preserve the revenues of the Church from being scooped into the pockets of the insurance

companies in the shape of unreasonable dividends and surplus. Such is the origin of the Catholic Mutual Relief Society, which like a Minerva sprang from the head of a Jupiter. The Society is not a regular insurance company; but is modeled on the lines of the Society of St. Vincent of Paul. It has come to the aid of many churches that have suffered losses by flood, explosion, fire, without getting even a single cent of insurance. It procures, by contract or otherwise, insurance against fire, lightning, tornadoes, and against any conceivable risk, at a very reasonable cost to its members. It does not exclude even the largest churches, institutions, or the personal property of the clergy. Since its inception the Society has handled over $30,000,000.00 of church insurance, and has already paid out $150,000.00 in claims. About one half of the entire number of Catholic dioceses in the United States and a number of religious orders are members of the Society, which is gradually absorbing the whole insurance of Catholic church property. Seven Bishops constitute the board of directors. The Society does not involve the personal liability of its members. Its cash fund has been of mushroom-like growth; and the organization is on as sound a basis as any human contrivance can be; *nisi Dominus custodierit civitatem, frustra vigilat qui custodit eam.*[5]

ANSELM KROLL.

La Crosse, Wis.

LUKE DELMEGE:—PART II. ILLUMINATION.[1]

XXXIV.—CREMONA AND CALVARY.

IT was the wish of the good Canon that Luke should spend a few days at his rectory. But Luke preferred Seaview Cottage. The Canon was always courteous, kind, hospitable. Father Martin was always outspoken, sometimes even brusque. Yet Luke preferred the easy comfort of Seaview Cottage, even though it sometimes blew heavy guns, to the calm, untroubled dignity of the rectory. The best of men like an armchair and the luxury of crossed legs. Yet the atmosphere even of the sunny library was

[5] Ps. 126: 2.

[1] *Copyrighted*, 1901, by the AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

sombre these dark days. It was only lighted by the eyes of Tiny and the laughter of Tony. Some time in the course of the evening, before they were dismissed to bed, the former, after a long and careful study of the grave, solemn stranger, drew a chair silently behind his, mounted on it, and flung her arms, and closed them, like a spring, around Luke's neck. He drew the child around and kissed her.

"There's somethin' hurtin' you dere," said the child, pointing to his breast pocket.

"True, Mignon," he said, drawing out a bundle of letters, which in all his hurry he had brought from home unopened. He had now leisure. The first was from his Bishop.

"A letter of condolence!" conjectured Luke. As he read it, his face fell. He handed the document to Father Martin It was a gentle reprimand; but it was a reprimand, and a bishop's words cut like an acid. Luke had been reported to his Bishop for not only permitting, but even encouraging, proselytism in his parish. The matter had been referred to his parish priest, who tried to extenuate it. Nevertheless, the facts remained; and the Bishop warned Luke to be more circumspect in future.

"I am hopelessly doomed," said Luke, "to desire what is good, and to accomplish the reverse."

"You look too much to principles—too little to men!" replied Father Martin.

"Could anything be better than to seek to reconcile and make mutually tolerant and helpful the two great classes in this country? Surely, it is the only solution of this apparently insoluble problem."

"Quite so. But did you ever consider that in this attempt you are seeking to reconcile not only interests which are hopelessly conflicting, but the very spirits of affirmation and negation?"

"I cannot see it," said the bewildered Luke.

"Don't you see the gist of this complaint?" said Father Martin. "The people object to the dethronement of their saints and heroes. These stand to them in the light of the embodiment of a great idea or principle. It is an affirmation that there have been, and therefore there can be again, heroism, bravery, truth, in this weary world. Now, your fine ladies come and with the best intentions

introduce the spirit of denial. 'Who art thou? What is thy name?' said the student to the Spirit of Evil. 'I am the Spirit that denies,' was the answer. And the little poodle of Reformation heresy that has been running around in circles for the last three hundred years has now swollen into the big monster behind the stove. And out of the swollen monster, Materialism, and to the music of the spirits of Poetry and the Fine Arts, steps the urbane, cultured scholar, who makes his bow: 'I am the Spirit who denies!'"

Luke shuddered.

"And yet," he said, "there are the sweetest, beautifullest souls I ever met over there across the border. Oh, what a riddle, what a puzzle!"

"Well, don't puzzle!" said the matter-of-fact Father Martin. "Keep close to your own people—the people of eternity! Let alone the sons and daughters of men!"

"The people of eternity!" Yes, indeed! so they are, as Luke was every day more fully ascertaining. Time and the world were nothing to his race, who seemed to look at everything as if they themselves were already disembodied.

Luke sat in the dim sacristy of Rossmore on the evening of All Saints'—the eve of All Souls' Day. A long list lay before him—the names of the departed, who were to be prayed for on the morrow. The sacristy was filled with an eager crowd, and there was a murmur of voices outside. One by one they came to the table, laid down the little offering, and with scrupulous exactness had the names of the deceased registered. There were tears on many faces, and many broken voices repeated the names of the dead, and always with a note of gratitude and respect. And not only relatives, but even the mere passing acquaintances of life, were remembered.

"For me poor boy, yer reverence, that's lyin' out on the snows of the Himalees."

"For the good father that reared me, and brought me up clane and dacent."

"For the poor sowl, yer reverence, that's in the greatest howlt."

Luke put down his pen.

"Any relation of your own?" It was his first blunder. He was coming round.

"Faix, it might be, yer reverence. How do I know? But no matther who it is—if it wor the blackest stranger from Galway, so long as they want it."

Luke wrote down his own translation.

"For Mary Carmody, yer reverence," said a voice in a whisper, that was made still more gentle by the hood of the shawl wrapped around the face.

"Your sister?" said Luke.

"Yerra, not at all, yer reverence! But a poor crachure, that we picked out of the sthreets. The old boy had his *glaum* upon her; but faix, we chated him in the ind."

"For me cummerade, Mike Mulcahy, yer reverence," said a stalwart pensioner, putting his hand to his forehead.

"Killed?" said Luke, who never wasted words.

"Begor, he was, yer reverence," said the pensioner, settling down for a long narrative, and utterly heedless of the fifty or sixty persons who were waiting behind him, and who had heard the story a hundred times. "It was in the Crimee, before Sebastopool, and we were lyin' in the trinches up to our nicks in mud; and the Rooshian shells flyin' over our heads, like a flock of crows cummin' home of an evenin'. 'Look,' sez I, 'an' put up yer head.' 'There's'n room,' sez he. 'Niver min', so,' sez I; and shure I'm thankin' the good God every day since, that I didn't sind him to his death. 'They're quiet now,' sez he 'and here goes!' 'What did ye see?' sez I. No answer. 'What did ye see?' sez I agin. No answer. 'What did ye see, ye —— of an omadhaun,' sez I. No answer. I looked round. His head was blown clane away. There was nothin' left but from his nick down, and"—

"Poor fellow!" said Luke, seeing the impatience of the crowd. "Well, I hope he was prepared."

"Prepared? Faix, he was. We all wint to confession a few days before to Father Walsh."

"I'll tell you what you'll do," said Luke. "I cannot afford to lose any of that story. Will you call at my house to-morrow night, and let me hear the whole thing from beginning to end?"

"Faix, I will, with pleasure," said the good pensioner; and he went away with his head in the air, six inches higher for the

honor. He always spoke of Luke after the interview as "me friend, Father Luke," adding: "That's the kind of min they want as army chaplains. If the Juke knew him, he'd have him in Aldershot in a mont'."

"For me parents, and deceased friends," said a strong, rough man, who spoke in a rather superior manner, as if he were offended by the want of tact shown by his predecessor. Luke wrote the names.

"Put down now, yer reverence," said the man, "the name of Martin Connolly, soldier of the Federal Army, who died from wounds received in the gallant charge of the Irish Brigade at Fredericksburg."

"That's hardly necessary," said Luke.

"Oh, but it is, yer reverence. I want me poor cummerade to get his rights in the next world, as he didn't get them in this."

"That was Meagher's Brigade," said Luke, in a moment of forgetfulness and enthusiasm.

The poor soldier smiled, drew himself up erect, and put out his right hand.

"Ah, you know it, yer reverence. God bless you! Put the hand there!"

Luke placed his hand in the big, broad palm. The old man raised it reverently, and kissed it.

"Put down the sowl of Thomas Francis Meagher, there, yer reverence," said he sobbing. "Sure it isn't I should forget him. I was as near to him as to yer reverence this minit on that day. 'Boys,' sez he, 'remimber who ye are! Sure 'tis I'm the proud man to be lading to death or victory the bravest and best min in the Federal Army. Boys,' sez he, 'there's your flag, don't disgrace it! I wish to God, boys,' sez he, 'that I had ye on the slopes of Slievnamon. Wouldn't we make the redcoats fly?' He stopped thin, as if he wor thinkin' of ould times and cummerades. 'Dimpsey,' sez he to the bandmaster, 'play up Brian Boru's march. Slope arms, four deep—forward!' And on we wint to our death. Father Walsh, not this man's Father Walsh," he said, jerking his hand contemptuously at the last pensioner, "but our own Father Walsh—God be wid him, he was the fine man—sat on his horse, as we passed by. He was a big man, wid

a big black beard, and he was raisin' his hand over us, as we marched past. I put me hand on his knee, and sez I, 'Father,' sez I, 'gi' me a double blessin', for I'm a double blagard.' He laughed, poor man, 'twas the last we seen of him. For we weren't twinty minits in the field, thryin' to take that hill (sure we might as well be thryin to take the gates of Heaven), whin down I wint, with a splinter of a shell in me calf; and down wint poor Martin, with a bullet in his left lung. We wor out on the field, all night in the cowld, watchin' the stars, widout a bit, bite, or sup, only the wounded moanin' and groanin' all around us. About twelve, we saw lights; and whin they kem near enough, we saw they wor the Confederate ginerals come out to see after their own. 'Here goes,' says Martin, shovin' in a cartridge; 'one shot at the rebelly rascals, and thin I die aisy.' 'Dang yer sowl, ye ruffian,' sez I, and 'twasn't that I said ayther, yer reverence,—'do ye want to go before God wid murder on your sowl?' 'They killed many a brave man to-day,' sez he, spittin' blood. 'Fair play is bonny play,' sez I, taking the rifle from the ruffian. An' shure, if he fired that shot, yer reverence, all the rebels in camp wud be among us in a minit, stabbin' and shootin' like the divil. But, I'm afeard I'm delayin' the nabors,' he said, turning round, 'that ould Crimean pinsioner kep ye sich a long time.'"

"This offering is too much for you," said Luke, pushing back a half-crown. "I'll keep just half."

"Not a bit of it, yer reverence," said the old man, pushing the coin back again. "We're not like these poor English *angashores*—on sixpence a day."

He passed out triumphant, though limping from that splintered shell. In a few minutes he returned, and pushed his way through the crowd of women to the table.

"I thought you might be forgettin', your reverence. Did you put down, Martin Connolly, soldier in the Federal Army, who died of gunshot wounds, received in action—"

"It's all right, it's all right!" said Luke.

"And Thomas Francis Meagher, Brigadier Gineral—"

"'Tis all right, 'tis all right!" said Luke.

It was a gloomy night, starless and moonless, and with a

heavy black brown pall, as of faded velvet, hanging down over the world, as Luke passed out from the iron gate, and picked his steps carefully down the uneven ways of the village street. He had passed up through his little garden, and was placing his latch-key in the door, when he became aware of a stooped, humble figure, evidently waiting for him near the doorway. The figure, silently and uninvited, followed him into the lighted hall.

"I have made bould to call on your reverence," said the voice, the voice of a wizened, old woman, whose face and figure were hidden under a mass of clothes.

"Well, my poor woman, and what can I do for you?" said Luke.

"I had nothin' to offer you," she said, "and I didn't like to be seen in the vesthry; but if your reverence would remimber in the Mass the sowl of Father O'Donnell—"

"Father O'Donnell? Father O'Donnell?" said Luke. "I never heard the name."

"Av coorse, you didn't, yer reverence," she said. "You're too young, God bless you! He's dead these forty years. 'Twas I nursed him in his last sickness, and he used to say, 'Nellie, don't you forget me in your Masses and prayers! The people think that we have no purgatory; but they don't know what a hard judgment we have for all the graces we get!' I remimber the words well. An' sure, if anny wan ever desarved Heaven, it was you, me poor, dear priest! But I have never forgotten thim words: an' I never left an All Sowls' Night pass without gettin' him mintioned in the Blessed Mass."

"It shall be done, my poor woman," said Luke, affectionately.

"God bless yer reverence!" she said, humbly passing out into the night.

And Luke sat down near his parlor fire. He didn't read. He had many things to think of. Thought, after a little while, became unbearable. He put on his biretta, and stepped out on his little garden walk. The night was extremely dark, and here and there a light shone in the village.[2] And, far above the village, out of the black breast of darkness, there gleamed the lights of the Lodge.

[2] In Ireland, lights are kept burning all night on All Souls' eve, as on Christmas eve.

The wind was moaning dismally; but it was a warm wind; and if one could believe that spirits in pain seek their places on earth to do penance for their transgressions, and to ask the alms of prayers for atonement, it would not be hard to realize that the heavens and the earth were haunted this eerie night, and that the pitiful prayer, *Miseremini mei! miseremini mei!* was the burden of the wailing wind. But it was not this, but the pathetic remembrance of the dead by these poor people that affected Luke deeply. He thought of his sister's words: "Luke dear, love the poor, and life will be all sunshine." And he did love them: loved them deeply, earnestly; but in that hard, mechanical way, that never touches their hearts. He wanted to lift them up; and lo! there they were on the summits of the eternal hills far above him. He desired to show them all the sweetness and light of life; and behold, they were already walking in the gardens of eternity! He was preaching the thrift of money to the misers of grace. Where was the use of talking about economizing to a people whose daily fancies swept them abroad to regions where Time was never counted? And the value of money to a race, who, if parsimonious and frugal, became so through a contempt of physical comfort, and who regarded the death of the rich man as the culmination of all earthly misfortune? Then it began to dawn upon Luke's reason that it was moral, not altogether economic, causes that were driving the people from their motherland. They were bitten by the dogs of Mammon here and there, and the unrest, that sought peace and pleasure in the saloon, and the electric-lighted streets, and the music-hall, and the theatre. And he began to understand what was meant when his confrères spoke of the creation of a new civilization, founded on Spartan simplicity of life, and Christian elevation of morals, and the uplifting to the higher life, to which all the aspirations of his race tended, instead of the steady downward degradation that was certain to ensue, if the new dogmas of mere materialism, founded on the purely natural virtues, were allowed to supplant the larger lights of the Gospel, and the sacred doctrines that set at utter naught all the ordinary dictates of selfish prudence and purely temporal ambitions. And if for a moment his old ideas returned of a race, self-seeking, prudential, hard-hearted, and endowed with all the vir-

tues of the fox and the squirrel, and his reason cried, Utopia, Utopia! to the creation of a spiritual Kingdom—well, here were the voices of the night, *Miseremini mei! miseremini mei!* the children of eternity crying to the children of time for the alms of prayer and sacrifice.

Luke was extremely busy this week. He had no time to prepare a sermon for Sunday. He had exhausted all his political economy; and he was beginning to tire of it. Saturday evening came. He had returned from his confessional; and he was depressed. Here, too, he was shunned by the people. Nothing used pain him so deeply as when entering the church on Saturdays or the eves of holidays, he saw his own confessional deserted, and a great crowd around the old pastor's "box;" and the little children, even, whom he loved so much, would hold down their heads, half afraid to be seen, or would look up with a shy, furtive glance at the grave, solemn curate. He could not understand it. He was always kind, gentle, merciful to penitents. Why was he shunned? He had lost the key of the supernatural; and he didn't know it. One word about grace and eternity; about the Sacred Heart or the Precious Blood; about the Virgin Mother or St. Joseph, would have opened floodgates of sorrow and love. Nay, if he had scolded them, and abused them, for their soul's sake, they would have loved him. But goodness for prudence sake—virtue, because it was a paying transaction in the long run, they could not well grasp; and all his exhortations fell, dry and withered, on hearts that thirsted for higher things.

He took up a newspaper this evening. There was a brief account of a certain battle that had been fought some centuries ago, in far Cremona. The details amused him—they were so characteristic. He laid down the paper.

"By Jove!" he said. "I will. I'll preach on Cremona and Calvary!"

He did; but it cost him a tremendous effort. He had trained himself so perfectly to self-restraint, particularly in his language, that his measured words fell, at first, on a cold and unsympathetic audience. He introduced the subject in connection with the great All Souls' Feast, which had just passed. He wished to

prove that love for the dead was always a characteristic of the race; that soldiers prayed for dead comrades—ay, even for the enemy they had destroyed. Then he spoke of Cremona; of the two regiments, Dillon's (the old Mountcashel Brigade) and Burke's that were quartered in the city. He drew a picture of the great French army, asleep in the famous Italian city—the stealthy approach of the enemy—their successful entry—their bivouac on the square while the garrison slept. The congregation woke up at the old familiar names—Dillon, Burke, Mountcashel. The U. S. pensioner and the Crimean veteran almost rose in their seats. And as Luke went on to describe the *reveillé* at midnight, the sleepers aroused from dreams to the terrible cry: "the enemy is upon us!" the sudden rush for arms, and then the mighty valor with which the two Irish regiments, in very pronounced undress, flung themselves unaided on the foe, and drove them beyond the walls, and then drew up at the bridge-gate that commanded the town entrances, and drove back charge after charge of the cuirassiers,—and all this, while their marshal was in the hands of the enemy,—he let himself go, the first time for many years, and painted with all the emphasis of Celtic imagination the valor of this remnant of the Irish Brigade. There was a broad smile on the faces of the people as he spoke of the *deshabille* and unfinished toilettes of these Irish exiles: but when he went on to describe how, after the battle, the victors went out to bury the dead, and found some hundreds of their fellow-countrymen amongst the Austrians, who had fallen under their own fire, and how they knelt and prayed over the dead, and then built a mighty cross over their remains, Celtic fire yielded to Celtic sorrow; and for the first time in his life, Luke saw tears on the faces of his audience. He went on to speak of the Calvaries that were everywhere erected in Catholic countries on the Continent—by the wayside, on mountain summits, at the corners of streets; and he expressed great surprise that in a Catholic country like Ireland, such manifestations of faith and piety were almost unknown. He closed his discourse by a homily on death—his own recent bereavement adding pathos to his words—and turned to the altar, with a full heart.

The first fruit of his sermon was visible in an excellent dinner.

Mary's temper was variable; and her moods affected her cuisine. This day, she did not know whether to laugh or to cry. The picture of these Irish fellows rushing straight from their beds at the foe, and driving, half armed and unarmored, four thousand Germans from the city, tickled her fancy. Then, the thought of Luke's mother (to whose death he had delicately alluded) subdued her; but she walked on air all that day; and Luke saw delicacies whose very names were unknown to him. And Mary told John confidentially:

"I knew the masther was always right; but priests can't talk out their minds, like common people."

There was a vast and sudden change, too, in the attitude of the great bulk of the parishioners. Instead of the shy, furtive looks—half-frightened, half-respectful—men walked up to him with a certain gay freedom, and accosted him. Some ventured so far as to say, with a cheery smile, "A fine day, Father Luke!" And the women curtsied, and whispered: "God bless your reverence every day you live!"

The village butcher, who held very strong National principles, and who was usually taciturn, if not surly, towards Luke, grew suddenly familiar. And sweetbreads, and liver, and kidneys began to pour into Luke's larder. And from afar, poor women brought in their early turkeys, for which they could get ten shillings a pair, and the yard became melodious with their cackling. And now, when he passed the young men on their Sunday walks, or going to work, instead of the silent, cold reverence of old with which they doffed their hats as they passed by, there was assumed a certain jaunty air of familiarity; and with it, a sort of confidential smile, as if they would say: "Well, your reverence, it *was* a good joke—that of those Irish *sans-culottes*, tearing like mad, through the streets and squares of Cremona."

About a fortnight after, as Luke was going out to say last Mass, he thought he saw something unusual in the landscape. He rubbed his eyes, and scrutinized carefully every minute feature, now so well known to him. At last he discovered the novelty. Beyond the red tiles of the village roofs, stretched the precipitous slope of woodland and forest in which the Lodge nestled. The Lodge was hardly visible in summer, so thick was the foliage of

beeches, and oaks, and elms. But there was always visible a white pencil of a flag-staff, crossed by a yardarm, and netted with white ropes. The gilt ball on its summit glittered whenever the sun shone; and, when the General was at home, the red flag of England gleamed like a flame of fire against the black foliage. Sometimes it was the Union Jack, sometimes the flag of an admiral of the high seas, sometimes one symbol, sometimes another; but always the flag of England. And some of the villagers passed it by unnoticed, and some stared at it curiously; and some, especially on days when the staff was garlanded by all the flag signals in the British Navy, cursed low and deep at the symbol of their subjection. This day, it was a gleam of red, against the deep umbers and ochres of the autumn woods; and right behind it, and cresting the summit of the hill, and clearly outlined against the grey sky, was an immense black cross. Luke rubbed his eyes again, and called Mary.

"Do you see anything strange there right over the Lodge?" he asked.

"Where, your reverence?" said Mary smiling, and looking everywhere but in the right direction. She had been in the secret for the last fortnight.

"There," said Luke, pointing. "There seems to be something unusual against the horizon-line."

"Oh! so there is," said Mary, slowly making the discovery. "There's something like a cross."

Then Luke saw that Mary was smiling.

After Mass, Luke strolled around the road that swept through the village and ran behind the General's demesne even to the summit. On the highest point of the hill the road cut off the demesne from the farms that were in the vicinity. And inside a hawthorn hedge and beyond the General's jurisdiction was a mighty cairn of stones, moss-grown, and lichen-covered, and dating from Druid times. It was visible for miles around, and was still known as *Knockane-na-Coppaleen*, the Little Hill of the Little Horses. No one dared touch it, though it was well known that gold was piled beneath; for didn't Farmer Mahony, a hard believer, once remove a few stones from the cairn to repair a ditch, and wasn't he struck dead on the spot? and weren't the stones

brought back to the cairn by invisible hands? Yet it could hurt no one to place the all-conquering Sign there—and there it was, cresting the cairn, an immense cross, with the spear and sponge, and a crown of real thorns hanging in the centre. Luke gazed long at the mighty symbol; then, turning round, he noticed that the turf or grass surface had been removed in regular patches on the face of the high slope. He moved down, far down, and then looked upward. Yes! unmistakably, in clear-cut letters on the grassy swards, and so large that they might be read from the far hills of Clare, that to-day looked near and threatening, were cut the words—

PRAISED BE JESUS CHRIST, FOR EVER!

XXXV.—A Lecture on Biology.

It was fortunate for Luke Delmege that this momentary contact with the best side of human nature had softened his feelings towards men. Because he was just now face to face with that most deadly temptation—to despise and shrink from his kind, and to live in such solitariness of thought as would barely allow a margin of time for the discharge of sacred duties. The mighty abstraction, Humanity, which he had worshipped in the high atmosphere of thought, had been rudely dispelled, and had left only the sordid precipitate of a few wrecked fragments of bones and dust. And in the awful revelations of the grave he read the utter insignificance of human life. He began to perceive, too, in his close observation of nature, that the same law was everywhere —life springing from the bosom of death, and then chased back into death again by the operations of some inexorable law. It was with infinite pity he saw how, in the springtime of the year, the buds had scarcely unfolded themselves in tender, silky leaves, when frost, or canker, or blight withered and dried up their infantine beauty; and, on the other hand, the leaves were hardly changed in color under the October frosts, when tiny buds shot forth only to be paralyzed and shrunk under the icy breath of winter. So, too, in the fairest child, death and decay made themselves manifest. Scarcely had life begun, when death stood by the cradle, his thousand-winged messenger of disease hovering around that infant form to arrest its growth and destroy it. The

carious teeth and the anæmic lips of young boys and girls affected him strangely. A chemist's shop, with all its sights and smells—its iodoform, and creosote, and carbolic, the ill-smelling wardens against decomposition and dissolution—made him sick. Death and decay haunted all Nature like a hideous spectre. So, too, in his reading, Luke gave up everything that was merely ephemeral. History he could not bear. What was it but the record of human passion and folly—that amateur theatricals of a race that must cheat time and ennui with its battles and diplomacy, and whose stage mimicry would be a tragedy, if its unimportance did not make it ludicrous. No. There was nothing lasting but the Idea and the Soul; and Luke turned away with loathing from his race and sought earth's only blessing of peace in solitude and thought. He was driven farther inward on himself by the attitude of his brethren towards him. They were kind, but critical. Their swift, impetuous ways, always seeking action, action—their emphatic principles, their intolerance of abstractions, and their insistence on facts; and all this, coupled with an idealism that seemed to him utterly visionary and impractical, alienated his sympathies from them. He was always unhappy in society, except, indeed, the society of his beloved pastor, whose suave gentleness subdued all riotous questioning on his part. And he haunted the mountains and the streams and the pine-woods, and came home happy from his association with the peace of Nature. A day on the lonely mountains, sitting over the rough bridge which spanned the yellow torrent, with the furze and the bracken waving around him, and a hare leaping out to wonder at him, and the whirr of the partridge over his head, and the fresh, clean air wrapping him around like a cool garment on a fever patient, and the long, lone vistas stretching away to the hazy hills that crowned the pathway of the lordly Shannon, was an unspeakable pleasure. But it was morbid. Not in action alone, or in thought alone, but in the interplay of thought and action, true life consists. And Luke was saved from this morbidity for a time by the opening up of men's hearts towards him. And when again he was driven back upon himself, this generous expansion of his people's affections always protected him from the temptation of contempt.

Immediately after the events narrated in the last chapter, he

made two gallant attempts to get into touch with the outer world. He was stung into making the attempts by some unkind things he had heard. It was but two simple phrases, but they meant so much. "Sub nube!" He only heard it in a whisper; but oh! how much it signified! And that cruel and unjust saying of Lactantius: "Literati non habent fidem!" so untrue, yet so easily applicable on the lips of the uncharitable, cut him to the quick, as it magnified the episcopal warning into a grave censure, which might be removed by Mother Church, but never by the world He determined to assert himself—to come out into the arena, as he had so often stepped into the palæstrum of his college, and show himself for all he was worth. There were two ways open to him, literature and the pulpit; two weapons, the voice and the pen.

He took down his books—some, alas! mildewed and damp from want of use—and set to work steadily. He gave himself full time for careful elaboration; and in six weeks he had a paper ready for the press. They were the happiest six weeks he had spent since his return to Ireland. Blessed is work! Blessed, the sentence: "In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou labor all the days of thy life!" He got his essay carefully typewritten, though typing was a costly novelty at the time; and sent it on to the Editor of a great *Quarterly* that was just then setting out boldly on its career as the organ of Science, Literature, Polemics, and Art, for all that was cultured in the country. In a few weeks, alas! the little roll was returned, with this letter:

OFFICE OF "THE INDICATOR," April 6, 188–.

My dear Luke:—In compliance with your modest request, and the dictates of the editorial conscience, I read your paper from Alpha to Omega. Like the famous critic, who opened "The Ring and the Book" for the first time, the dreadful suspicion crossed my mind: Have I become suddenly demented? On the suggestion of my sub. we read the paper backwards; and then a great light dawned. Nothing could give me greater pleasure than to oblige an old schoolmate; but if I published your paper, there would be an immediate demand for auxiliary asylums all over the country; and the doctors would at last have a tangible cause for the increase in insanity, instead of tracing it to that harmless drug, called Tea. Accepting your theory, however, about the *Identity of Contradictories*, I accept your paper; and, in the same sense, you will hereby find enclosed a check for £20.

I am, dear Luke, Yours etc., THE EDITOR.

P. S.—You will pardon an editorial joke, for *auld lang syne's* sake. But, my dear Luke, you are a hundred years behind, or a hundred years in advance of your

age. Don't you know we are just now passing through the "bread-and-butter" cycle? that we have hung up *Erin-go-bragh*; and are taking Sidney Smith's advice about Erin-go-bread-and-butter—Erin-go-boots-without-holes-in-them, etc., etc.? Write me something practical, thou agricultural curate—the quantity of nitrogen in a cubic foot of solid guano, how to get sulphur out of turnips, and sugar of phosphorus out of apples, or anything that will help on the material prosperity of the country; but abandon your idealism, and not only for a time, but for ever. How I envy you!

O, fortunatos nimium, sua si bona norint!

My only chance of exercise is on a piano-stool, which is my tripod; and on which I make conscientiously three thousand gyrations every day. And you, on your gallant steed, spurning the earth, and climbing the Heavens! Ah, me!!!

Luke read the letter three or four times. He was disappointed; but he could not be angry. The good humor of his old classmate disarmed him. And certainly it was a good joke, that Luke Delmege, the methodical, the practical, the realist, should be warned off from the dangers of a too exuberant imagination.

"There is no end to the human enigma," he said, as he tied the roll and flung it into the recesses of his bookcase.

Some months after, he was invited to lecture at a great literary club in the city. The letter of invitation implied that Luke's estrangement from the active life of the Church around him was extremely unlike all that they had read about his career in England; and gently hinted that a persistence in these solitary habits would infallibly lead to his being considered peculiar and strange. The subject of the lecture was left to his own selection, with one proviso—it should be up-to-date.

With all his morbid shrinking from publicity, partly the result of the secret contempt of men of which we have spoken, and partly arising from a dread of being misunderstood, Luke would have declined the invitation; but that word "peculiar" stung him; and he determined to go, and show the world what he was, and what he might have been. He ransacked his brains and his library for an up-to-date subject; and, at last, decided that biology—the latest of the sciences—was exactly suitable to his own tastes and the capacities of his audience. He wrought laboriously at his lecture, determined it should be his last cast of the dice.

There was a full house; and a brilliant gathering of priests and laymen on the platform. The president happily and generously spoke of Luke's splendid career in college, and his after-successes on the mission; and he spoke so warmly and so sym-

pathetically, that Luke felt all his anger against mankind oozing away; and all the bitter things that had come back to his ears, all the more bitter for the translation, began to fade away in happy feelings of trust and love and gratitude. When will the world understand the mighty magic of kind words? Luke rebuked himself. "It is self-knowledge," he said, "that has made me uncharitable." Surely the heart enshrines mysteries and secrets beyond the power of its own divination!

His young spirits bounded back at this generous introduction; and he spoke under the intoxication of stimulated genius. His reception by the audience, too, was cordial, almost enthusiastic. His fine figure, a face animated with the glow of talent and the excitement of a novel experiment, his clear, well-modulated, ringing voice, that sounded quite musical even after the splendid chorus of the Orchestral Union of the society, seemed to awaken all present to the fact that this lecture was to be something quite unique in their experiences. Nor were they disappointed. It was a clear, well-knit lecture, full of facts, as well as arguments; and when Luke completed a peroration in which he welcomed every fact, and scorned every conclusion of modern science, and declared that the cry of the Church in every age, most of all in our own, is for "Light! more light! that all knowledge may finally expand and be lost in the Light Supernal,"—the audience, mostly young men, arose, and gave him an ovation that seemed to console him for all his years of enforced seclusion. One member after another stood up to express his gratification; and then—well, then—there was the "little rift within the lute," that was tingling so musically in his ears. For one member made a comic speech about the "blasto-derms" and "gemmules" and "amœba" which Luke had introduced into his lecture; and another hinted the suspicion that it was fine, but was it sound? It was eloquent; but was it orthodox? Luke flushed angrily. The president intervened. He took Luke's part nobly; and, being a man of vast erudition, and unimpeachable honor, his words were regarded as final. But the sting remained. And for many months did Luke puzzle himself with the enigma that the more closely he studied, and the more accurately he expressed himself, the more was he misunderstood. He spoke angrily on the subject once to a lively confrère.

"I'd advise you, Luke," said the latter, "to keep to Grattan and O'Connell, or that venerable subject—The relative merits of a monarchy and a republic, or—Was Napoleon a greater warrior than Wellington? You can't trip there?"

"But I didn't trip," protested poor Luke.

"Of course not! of course not!" said the confrère.

But there was one member of the audience that famous evening who was utterly disgusted and disedified. Matthew O'Shaughnessy was a retired merchant, who had accumulated a pretty fortune in the bacon and butter line; and, having provided well for his family, he wisely determined to retire from business, and, with his excellent wife, to spend the twilight of their lives in peace. He was a very pious man; kind, and good, and charitable, almost to a fault. But he had one imperfection—only one; and that, very venial. He was critical, especially about matters affecting religion or the Church. He always raised his silk hat—for he was a dreadful formalist and belonged to the old school—when passing a priest in the streets; kindly, if he met an acquaintance; ostentatiously, if he met a stranger. But he would not salute a priest who was cycling. He thought it undignified and unbecoming.

He sat, on Sundays, a little distance from the pulpit; so near, that, being somewhat deaf, especially in the left ear, he might hear the preacher; so far, that he might see him, and watch his expression and gestures. When the Gospel of the day had been read, which Matthew followed word by word from his prayer-book to see was it correctly rendered, he sat with the audience, but slightly turned towards the wall, and with his right hand folded over and pressing down his ear. If the remarks of the preacher pleased him, he punctuated them with several nods of the head and half-audible remarks: "That's good!" "Bravo!" "I wouldn't doubt you!" If the preacher was weak or irrelevant, Matthew turned around, wiped his spectacles, and read his prayer-book. He objected strenuously to "priests in politics;" and often asked: "What in the world are the bishops doing?"

On the evening of Luke's lecture, Matthew, as an honorary member of the committee, should have been on the platform with the priests and distinguished laymen, and grievous was the dis-

appointment of many who had been anticipating a great treat from Matthew's remarks on biology. But he came in late—they said, purposely so—and was accommodated with a seat at the furthest end of the hall. He took it graciously, bowed all around to the young men, took out his red silk handkerchief and folded it on his knee, leaned slightly forward, folding his right hand over his ear, and listened. Luke was just saying that scientists had not yet fully determined whether man was a regenerate and fully-evolved anthropoid ape, or whether the anthropoid ape was a degenerate man; and he instanced experiments that had lately been made in London on a certain simian, called Sally, who was made to count numerals up to ten by placing straws in her mouth. Matthew's face lengthened, as he listened with open mouth. He couldn't believe his ears. He looked around cautiously to see what effect these extraordinary statements were producing on the faces of the young men around him. They were preternaturally solemn. He listened again. This time Luke was using manifestly profane language. Matthew looked around. The boys shook their heads mournfully and nudged each other. They then looked to Matthew for a clue. "I thought so," he said, drawing in his breath sharply. "I knew my sinses didn't deceive me. Did any mortial man ever hear the like from a priest before?" But, then, here was a chorus of congratulation from president, vice-president, and committee.

"I wouldn't stand it, if I was you," whispered a young man, who read Matthew's mind as it were a book. "'Tis a burning shame, and you're one of the committee."

But just then the one critic was opening his batteries on the lecture and expressing grave doubts about the lecturer's orthodoxy. Matthew was delighted.

"Good man!" he whispered. "Go on! Pitch into him! Right you are! Send it home!"

He then folded his silk handkerchief with a sigh, took up his silk hat, and turned round. He saw the expectant faces.

"Well," said he, "if that doesn't bang Banagher, I'm—a—I'm—a—street-preacher. What the—— is comin' over the counthry at all, at all?"

He went out into the night. It was a moonlit night, very

bright, and soft and balmy. The streets were deserted. The audience had remained for the final chorus. Matthew was puzzled, angry, shocked. He had to relieve his feelings. He addressed Diana, as there was no one else around.

"Egor! 'tis a quare business altogether! We don't know whether 'tis on our heads or heels we're standin' with these young men! Did anny wan ever hear the like before from the lips of a Roman Catholic clergyman? Egor! Jim the mule, and Mike the rogue, an' Sally the ape! Wasn't the poor 'uman as good as God made her? An' if He didn't make her as handsome as me young bucko, wasn't that His business? An' why should any poor 'uman be called an ape?"

Diana looked solemnly down, conscious of her own beauty, on these microbes of earth, but did not reply. Matthew went further towards home. Then his feelings overpowered him again, and striking the reverberating flags with his heavy stick, he again addressed Diana.

"That was bad enough; but whin he comminced cursin' and blasphemin', I thought he'd rise the roof aff. 'Blast ho! Jane Ettick,' he says; 'blast ho! Jer Minahal!' Egor! the ind of the world is comin'! What will Mary say, I wondher!"

Mary had been taking a gentle snooze over the parlor fire, while the cat slept at her feet, and the kettle sang on the hob. She woke up on Matthew's entrance, rubbed her eyes, and said, dreamily:

"'Pon my word, Matcha, I believe I was akchally asleep. How did ye like the leckshure?"

Mary looked well in her black silk dress, and the thin gold chain around her neck; but Matthew was too indignant to heed such things just then.

"Lave me alone, 'uman," he said. "Where are the matayriels?"

Mary said nothing, but touched the bell. She was accustomed to these moods. The "matayriels" were brought in, and Matthew, with sundry grunting soliloquies, brewed his tumbler. He then bent forward, and placing the tips of his fingers together between his knees, he said:

"Mary O'Shaughnessy, you and me are a long time in this wurruld, and maybe we'll be longer, plase God; but of all the

demonsthrations and exhibitions you ever hard of, to-night bate thim all."

He moistened his lips. Mary woke up.

"If it was a Methody, or a Prosbyterian, or wan of these new acrostics, that I hear 'em talk of sometimes below there, I wouldn't be surprised. But a Roman Catholic clergyman, an ordained minister of God, who'll be standing at the althar to-morrow mornin'—"

Here Matthew's feelings overpowered him. He threw out his hands in an attitude of horror and unspeakable disgust, and then moistened his lips.

"What was it about, at all?" said Mary, to help out her husband's inability to explain.

"About? I'll tell you, thin. It appears that this young gintleman was in England; and there, like here, the blagards will call names. But what was the manin' of telling a respectable congregation about Jim the mule, and Mike the rogue? But that wasn't all. There was a poor half-deminted crachure over there, called Sally, and what did they do wid her, d'ye think? Brought the poor 'uman up upon a stage, and asked her to count tin. And whin she couldn't, they put sthraws in her mout', and made her take 'em out, wan by wan, to count 'em. But," continued Matthew, as he laid down his wine glass, "that wasn't the worst of the business. Mary O'Shaughnessy, did you ever hear a priest curse?"

"Yerra, what's comin' over you, Matcha?" said Mary, peering at her husband intently. "Curse? a priest curse? Niver, nor you ayther!"

"Didn't I?" said Matthew. "Faix, an' I did. Not wance or twice nayther; but every second word from his mout'."

"If I didn't know you, Matcha O'Shaughnessy," said Mary, with some anger, "I'd say you wor dhramin'."

"Faix, I wasn't, nor more nor you this minit," said Matthew. "Egor, I thought he'd rise the roof av me head. 'Blast yah, Jane Ettick,' he says; not 'you,' at all, but 'yah,' wid his grand English accent: 'Blast yah, Jer Minahal! Blast yah, Dermody'—"

Mrs. O'Shaughnessy was tapping the brass fender with her slipper in an ominous manner; and her eyes were glinting, like

the sparks in the grate; but Matthew, with all the unconsciousness of a fatal mortal, went on, twisting poor Luke's scientific terminology into horrible profanity. Then the storm broke suddenly.

"D'ye know what I'm after thinkin', Mr. O'Shaughnessy?" she said, in an accent of forced calmness.

"Somethin' good, Mary, I'm sure," said Matthew, a little frightened and surprised.

"I'm thinkin', Matcha O'Shaughnessy," said Mary, beating time with her slipper, "that you lifted yer little finger wance too often since yer dinner."

"If you mane, Mary," said Matthew, apologetically, yet sure of his defence, "that I took dhrink, ye were never more mistaken in yer life. Since the day I took the teetotal pledge for life from Father Matcha, me friend, down there in the bowlin' green, exactly twenty-five years ago, come this Christmas, on two dhrinks a day, and whatever the doctor would ordher as medicine, I never tasted a dhrop since."

"Thin can't you let yer priests alone?" cried Mary, angrily turning around.

"Yerra, is 't me, 'uman?" cried Matthew. "Yerra, I'd die for me priests!"

"Thin why are you always nagging at 'em, an' placin' 'em and faultfindin' with 'em? Begor, the poor gintlemin can't please ye, at all, at all. If they wear a high bayver, they're too grand; an' if they wear a Jurry-hat, they're demanin' thimselves. If they're goin' about their juty in the sthreets, they ought to be at home; and if they stay at home, why aren't they walking the sthreets? If they go to Kilkee or Lisdoonvarna for a bret' of fresh air, they're spindin' the money of the poor; an' if they stop at home, they're savin' and miserly. If they take their masheens an' go out for a whiff of fresh air, afther bein' cooped up all day in their boxes, pious craw-thumpers an' althar-scrapers won't take aff their hat to God's ministers—"

"Yerra, 'uman, take yer tongue aff av me," cried Matthew in agony. "Sure, I'd lie down in the mud of the sthreets, and lave me priests walk over me body—"

"Begor," continued Mary, now thoroughly roused, "wid yere

Parnellites, an' yere Indepindints, an' yere Faynians, there's no respect for God nor man. Ye'll be soon tellin' the Pope of Rome what he ought to do. But 'tis only sarvin' 'em right. Manny and manny's the time I tould 'em: 'Do as the ould priests did—give 'em the stick acrass the small of their back, an' they'll respect ye.' But, begor now, the priests of the Church must take aff their Caroline hats to ivery little whipster of a girl that comes home from her convent school wid her rowl of music under her arrum—"

"Go on!" said Matthew resignedly, turning round to his only consolation. "What the Scripture says is true: There's no stoppin' a burnin' house, nor a scouldin' 'uman."

"An' what'd ye be, widout yere priests?" continued Mary, unheeding. "Who looks after the poor and the sick? Who goes out into the house where there's sickness and faver, and browncheeties, and mazles? Who gets up yere Young Min's Societies for ye? An' yere concerts? Who's at the top, bottom, and middle of iverything that's good or gracious—in the counthry—"

"Yerra, 'uman, shure I'm not denying that our priests are good!" pleaded Matthew in despair.

"An' there ye are, like a parcel of unwaned childre wid yere mouths open to be fed. 'Tis the priest here; an' the priest there! An' very little thanks they get for their throuble afther all. But, believe you me, Matcha O'Shaughnessy," continued Mary, in a tone of great solemnity, "an' believe you me agin, there's a day of reck'nin' comin'; and manny a poor crachure, who hasn't as long a bade as you or your aiquals, may inter the Kingdom of Heaven afore ye. But take me advice—let the priests alone! They belong to God; an' if they go astray let Him dale wid them!"

There was a deep, solemn hush of ten minutes' duration after this tornado. Matthew was struck dumb. What can a poor fellow do but bite the dust after a cyclone? "Tic-tac," solemnly went the clock on the mantelpiece. "Tick, tick, tick, tick, tick, tick," went Mary's gold watch in her belt. At last Matthew raised himself with a deep sigh; and commenced to compose an *Eirenicon*. When this was ready, he said, in a gentle and deferential whisper:

"Mary!"

There was no reply.

"Mary!" he said, more loudly.

"Well?" said Mary, without looking round.

"Mary, I'm makin' a little sup for you."

"You won't," said Mary crossly.

"But I say I will," said Matthew. "Mary, I've been noticin' for a long time that you're not lookin' quite yerself. You're only pickin' and pickin' at your males like a young chicken. Why, you ate no more for your brekfus thin a child of four. You must see the docthor, and take somethin' every day for nourishment. Here, take this!"

"'Tis too sthrong," said Mary, making a grimace over the steaming wineglass.

"'Tis *not* too sthrong," said Matthew, in a tone of righteous indignation. "'Twill rouse you up."

"Put a little hot wather in it," said Mary pleadingly.

"I will *not* put hot wather in it," said Matthew. "Is it to make you sick, I'd be?"

"Well, I'll lave it up there to cool," said Mary, placing the wine-glass on the mantlepiece.

After a long pause, during which the temperature settled down to normal, Mary said:—

"That young priest is a cousin of mine!"

"What young priest?" said Matthew, with affected indignation.

"The young pracher," said Mary.

"Is't Father Delmege you mane?" said Matthew.

"Yis," answered Mary. "He's me second and third cousin be me mother's side."

"An' why didn't ye tell me that before?" said Matthew. "Did I iver see such people as women are? They draw you out, and out, an' out, like a talliscope, until you make a fool of yerself, and thin they shut you up with a snap. But, faix, an' 'tisn't because I'm sayin' it to yer face, ye have raison to be proud of him."

"I'm tould he's a fine-lookin' man," said Mary.

"Fine? Fine is no name for him. He's wan of the grandest min ye ever saw in a day's walk."

"I suppose he'll be comin' to see me," said Mary, "if only on account of his poor mother."

"D'ye think will he come to-night?" said Matthew, in alarm.

"Faix, he might. He might dhrop over afther his supper."

"I'm better be puttin' these things out of the way," said Matthew, hastily removing the glasses. "I'm tould he hates this, as the divil hates holy wather."

Just then, a tremendous knock was heard at the hall-door.

"Here he is!" said Mary, straightening herself up, and arranging her toilette. "Do I look all right, Matcha?"

"Never better in yer life," said Matthew. "He'll be the proud man whin he sees you."

There was a colloquy in the hall; then a heavy foot on the stairs. In answer to a rather timid knock, Matthew shouted "Come in!" The door opened just a little, the servant maid put in her tousled head, and said:

"The milkman, ma'am, sez he wants that tuppence for the mornin's milk!"

"Bad luck to you and the milkman together," said Mary. "Here!"

But Luke did call the following day; and he was very grand, but gracious, and even affectionate. He had been learning that in this old land, and amongst its simple, faithful people, there were mighty treasures of warmth and love, for which the cold, steely polish of other lands was but a poor exchange. And Matthew and Mary lived on the honor for days afterwards, and cut out the paragraph in the paper about "The Lecture on Biology," and Matthew went around, and asked everyone, "Did they ever hear the like before?" and "Why the mischief doesn't the Bishop bring that grand young man into the city?" And Mary placed on her mantelpiece, side by side with the portrait of the Bishop himself, Luke's photograph, gorgeously framed; and in answer to all inquiries, she said modestly:

"Me cousin, Father Luke!"

ELECTION BRIBES AND RESTITUTION IN CONSCIENCE.

DURING an electoral contest, A—— offers B—— twenty dollars if he will vote for C——. B meant to vote for D; but in consideration of the money, agrees to vote for C, which he does. Being afterwards troubled in conscience, he lays the matter before his confessor, who obliges him to give the money back to A.

An Instruction to Confessors which lies before me, warns the priest that he cannot impose a strict obligation of restitution in such cases as the foregoing, but can only urge the penitent to bestow his ill-gotten gains, or at least part thereof, in alms. The confessor is referred to Gury, *De Contractibus*, n. 760, and to St. Alphonsus, *Lib.* III, n. 712. It is the *contractus de re turpi* that is dealt with in the places to which the references are given. Both authors lay it down as the more commonly received and more probable opinion that, when the contract has been carried out, the person who does the illicit or sinful act may keep the price he gets for doing it, or at any rate is not strictly bound to make restitution. Not that a claim to compensation can be based upon the sinful act as sinful, but as serviceable to the other party, or laborious in itself, or as being the act of one who is master of his own acts, and can consequently dispose of them for a price, if he is so minded. He sins, indeed, in making the contract and in carrying it out. But that is a matter between himself and God. It does not affect the claim of natural justice arising out of the innominate contract *facio ut des.*

St. Alphonsus says:[1] "Quoad meretrices commune est, et certum inter DD., quod possint retinere pretium meretricii praestiti. . . . Pro aliis vero maleficiis, pro ferenda sententia injusta, vel patrando homicidio, adulterio, fornicatione, etc., duplex est sententia probabilis," etc. In the case of a bribe taken "pro ferenda sententia injusta," we have an exact parallel to the case put above. But do these two cases belong to the same category as the others given by St. Alphonsus, and are they to be solved by the same principle? The following passage in the *Summa* of St. Thomas[2] bears directly on the point:

[1] *Loc. cit.*

[2] 2ª 2ae, a. 5, ad 2

Aliquis dupliciter aliquid dat illicite. Uno modo quia ipsa datio est illicita et contra legem, sicut patet in eo qui simoniace aliquid dedit, et talis meretur amittere quod dedit: unde non debet ei restitutio fieri de his. Et quia etiam ille qui accepit contra legem accepit, non debet sibi retinere, sed debet in pios usus convertere. Alio modo aliquis illicite dat, quia propter rem illicitam dat, licet ipsa datio non sit illicita, sicut cum quis dat meretrici propter fornicationem. Unde et mulier potest sibi retinere quod ei datum est, sed si superflue ad fraudem vel dolum extorsisset, tenetur eidem restitutere.

It will be seen that St. Thomas divides into two distinct classes the cases that are commonly brought together under the head of *contractus turpis.* It will also be observed that *simonia* and *quaestus meretricius* are merely given as examples, each of its own class. The former is an example of that class of cases in which the very act of giving or taking for a price is unlawful—*i. e.*, contrary to some law that is binding in conscience. The latter is an example of that class of cases in which, not the giving or taking for a price in itself, but that for which the price is taken is unlawful. This will seem at first sight a subtle distinction; and so it is, at least in the sense of being hard to grasp fully. It is, however, a very important distinction. For note how different is the decision which the Saint gives in the one class of cases from that which he gives in the other. In the second case, the money may be kept. In the first, restitution must be made, not to the one from whom the money was received, but to the Church or the poor—"debet in pios usus convertere." The ground of the decision in the second case is, that where there is no law against giving and taking for a price, but only against that which is so given or taken, it is no breach of natural justice to take and keep the price. The ground of the decision in the other case is, that where such law exists, the buying and selling is void of effect. Under that law, and in the case of persons who are subject to the law, the one who gets the price has no valid title to it.

Under the law of nature, to which all men are subject, two conditions are requisite to the validity of the contract of buying and selling. The first is that the thing which is offered for sale shall be really *pretio aestimabile*, or, in commercial parlance, a marketable commodity. The second is, that the party who sells shall own and have the disposal of that which he offers for sale. Now, in all cases where it is the thing, and not the giving or taking it for a price, that is wrong, both of these conditions may be fulfilled, and the contract will give a valid title, under the

natural law, to the price that is paid for the wrongdoing. Suppose A agrees to give B ten dollars for setting fire to C's barn, the money to be paid when the thing is done. B's share in the transaction is *pretio aestimabile*, as much so in itself as any lawful service that he may render A. Also, he has dominion over his own acts and can dispose of them for a price if he will. But, it will be said, though he is physically free to dispose of his own acts, he is not morally free to do A the particular service bargained for. No; and for this reason he is under the strictest sort of moral obligation not to do it. The law of natural justice towards God forbids him to do it: "Est enim pietas," says Cicero, "justitia adversus deos." The law of natural justice towards his fellow-man forbids him to do it: *ne cui noceas* is a dictate of nature's law. But neither *pietas adversus Deum* nor *justitia adversus proximum* forbids him to take a price for the unlawful service after it has been rendered. And therefore, while he has to square his conscience with the first dictate of natural justice by sincere repentance, and with the second dictate of natural justice by making good, in default of the man who hired him, the damage done his neighbor, he can take his stand with a safe conscience on a third dictate of natural justice which requires the stipulated price to be paid for every service that is in itself *pretio aestimabile*. So much for the class of cases in which it is the thing that is wrong, and not the giving or taking it for a price.

In the other class of cases, such as simony, bribing of judge or elector, taking money from a thief for not "telling on" him, and all cases where it is the giving or taking for a price that is in itself wrong, the one who takes the price has no valid title to it, even after he has fulfilled his part of the unlawful contract. The reason is that the conditions are wanting which the law of nature itself requires for the validity of the contract. That which is of its very nature sacred and spiritual is in the strictest sense priceless, and in any case does not belong to the man to whom the dispensation of it has been committed. So the decision of a judge or vote of an elector is of its very nature a priceless entity. It is not of the class of things that are bought and sold, but is, by the law of nature, and ought to be, like honor and virtue, unpurchasable. The other condition, too, is wanting here. For the authority which the judge has to render a decision in accordance with the evidence, and the

right of the elector to vote according to the dictates of his conscience, are not things of which they have the ownership and can dispose of at will, but sacred trusts committed to them by society to be conscientiously discharged. The same, and even more, is to be said of the right of a man to denounce a thief to the authorities. It does not belong to the order of things that are bought with a price, and is not the private property of the individual, but a something that society has invested him withal for the social good. Nay, it is not properly a right at all, but rather a duty that he owes the community.

It may here be urged that the act of the simoniacal person, as well as of the corrupt judge or elector, is, equally with the act of him who sets fire to his neighbor's barn, *pretio aestimabile*—not, indeed, as sinful, but as serviceable, laborious, etc. To this it is replied, that serviceable or laborious though it be, the act of the man who administers sacred things, dispenses justice, or exercises the suffrage, is of its very nature unpurchasable, for the reason that it is inseparably bound up with what is of its nature inalienable as a right or duty. The act is not one which a man can dispose of for a price, since he already owes it to society, of which he is the agent, and from which he gets his reward in money or protection for labor done or service rendered. It is against every dictate of natural justice that he should be paid for failing in his duty towards society and betraying his trust. And yet it is precisely under this aspect of his act that the price is paid for it, since it is not his to dispose of for a price in so far as it is serviceable or laborious. On the other hand, the man who, being nobody's servant, and master of his own acts, hires himself out to do a service which is, though unlawful, of its nature purchasable and *pretio aestimabile*, commits, indeed, sin by his act; but, having done it, he can claim his hire from the man who engaged him. And so we come round once more to the Saint's distinction, for it is the act that is wrong in this case, not the doing of it for a price; while in the other instance it is the doing of it for a price that is wrong and against natural justice, not the act itself. The act of exercising the suffrage is of itself just; it is the doing of it for a price that is unjust. The act of destroying another man's property is unjust; the getting a price for it may be justified on the principle of natural equity, which underlies the innominate contract *facio ut des.*

From what has been said it also follows that a judge cannot keep the bribe given him even when he returns a verdict in accordance with the facts; nor the elector the money he gets for his vote, even when he votes according to the dictates of his conscience. For every such contract is void by the law of nature which dictates that no price shall be given or taken for that which is (1) not one's own, and (2) outside the order of things that are bought with a price.

There is one more point to be considered. St. Thomas teaches that restitution is to be made in such cases, but not to the one from whom the money has been received. How is this? The Saint simply says, "*talis meretur amittere quod dedit*"—that is, the man does not deserve, or has no right, to get his money back. This implies that the price paid is by the law of nature forfeit to society. Two other reasons may be given. The first rests on the principle, *scienti et volenti non fit injuria.* The man of his own free will agreed to pay a price for what was in itself unpurchasable, but what he wished to obtain by the payment of a price. He got what he wanted for his money, what he looked upon as the worth of his money. Therefore, he has no longer a claim to his money; else one can have and hold what one has bought and with it the price that one has paid for it; which is absurd. Again, there is that other principle, *nemo ex propria iniquitate commodum reportare vel ditescere debet.* The fellow who goes about buying votes would do a thriving business if the man whose vote he buys were bound to pay him back the money, even after the vote was cast according to agreement. He would have the suffrage—and his money back into the bargain.

If the distinction made by St. Thomas had been kept steadily in view, there would perhaps be no divergence of opinion among moralists in regard to cases arising out of the *contractus turpis.* Be this as it may, according to the Saint's doctrine—and it is a doctrine that rests solidly on the essential conditions which natural law requires for buying and selling—the opinion that one who takes a bribe for his vote may keep the money, or at any rate is not strictly bound to put it away from him *in reipublicae utilitatem vel in usum pauperum,* is wholly destitute of intrinsic probability, and cannot therefore be followed with a safe conscience.

Antigonish, Nova Scotia. ALEX. MACDONALD, D.D.

Analecta.

EX ACTIS LEONIS XIII.

EPISTOLA SS. D. N. LEONIS PP. XIII AD CARDINALEM GIBBONS CANCELLARIUM MAGNI LYCAEI WASHINGTONIANI, EPISCOPOS EXHORTANS UT ALUMNOS AD LYCAEUM MITTANT.

Dilecto Filio Nostro, Jacobo Tit. S. Maria trans Tiberim S. R. E. Presb. Cardinali Gibbons, Archiepiscopo Baltimorensi.

LEO PP. XIII.

Dilecte Fili Noster, Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem:

Studium, quo, vel ab inito Pontificatu, foederatarum Americae Civitatum Ecclesiam complexi fuimus, illud etiam suasit Nobis, ut Lyceum magnum quamprimum Washingtoniae condi urgeremus, conditum vero confirmaremus auctoritate Nostra omnique benevolentia. Quod enim requirebant tempora, id Nobis maxime cordi fuit; ut videlicet invenes, qui in cleri spem educarentur, virtutibus quidem primum, tum tamen etiam divinis humanisque disciplinis quam optime imbuerentur. Quae porro de Washingtoniano Lyceo subinde accepimus, non irritam fuisse fiduciam Nostram ostendebant; illud autem laetiora modo capere incrementa tum ob largi-

tatem catholicorum, tum ob decurialium doctorum peritiam et auctoritatem, tuae litterae testantur, quas nuperrime dedisti. Unum restare adhuc videtur, ut nobile Institutum auditorum etiam frequentia floreat; quod sane ex Episcoporum industria atque studio expectandum est. Qui si, missis Washingtoniam alumnis, carere forsan utilitate aliqua, in sua quisque dioecesi, ad tempus videbuntur; at longe majus capient emolumentum, tum sibi tum universae Americanae Ecclesiae, dum clerus una eademque doctrina, uno eodemque spiritu informetur. Haec Nos ex voluntate bona sperantes, qua vos Ecclesiarum vestrarum commoda decusque contenditis; tibi Dilecte Fili Noster, Rectori, doctoribus, alumnis, Washingtonianae Universitatis Apostolicam benedictionem, Nostrae caritatis testem, amantissime impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die XIII, Iunii MCMI, Pontificatus Nostri anno vicesimo quarto.

E S. CONGREGATIONE INDICIS.

DECRETUM.

Sacra Congregatio Eminentissimorum ac Reverendissimorum Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae Cardinalium a SANCTISSIMO DOMINO NOSTRO LEONE PAPA XIII *Sanctaque Sede Apostolica Indici librorum pravae doctrinae, eorumdemque proscriptioni, expurgationi ac permissioni in universa christiana republica praepositorum et delegatorum, habita in Palatio Vaticano die 7 Iunii 1901, damnavit et damnat, proscripsit proscribitque, atque in Indicem librorum prohibitorum referri mandavit et mandat quae sequuntur opera:*

EM. COMBE.—Le grand coup avec sa date probable, c'est-à-dire le grand châtiment du monde et le triomphe universel de l'Église.—Étude sur le secret de la Salette. 3e édit. augmentée de la brochure de Mélanie et autres pièces justificatives.—Vichy, 1896.

JEAN DE DOMPIERRE.—Comment tout cela va finir. L'avenir jusqu'à la fin des temps; histoire anticipée des derniers âges du monde.—Rennes, 1900.

JOSEF MÜLLER.—Der Reformkatholizismus, die Religion der Zukunft. Für die Gebildeten aller Bekenntnisse dargestellt. Erster und zweiter Theil.—Würzburg-Zürich, 1899.

F. REGIS PLANCHET.—El derecho canónico y el clero mexicano, ó sea anotaciones al concilio V mexicano.—México, 1900.

Idem.—La enseñanza religiosa en la arquidiocesis de México, y suplemento á la obra "El derecho canónico."—México, 1900.

CAMILLE QUIÉVREUX.—Le paganisme au XIX^e^ siècle. 3 vol.—Abbeville, 1895–97.

ترس العاجز المظلوم وعدل الى باالباغي المنقوم (s. l. a. et t.).

Itaque nemo cuiuscumque gradus et conditionis praedicta opera damnata atque proscripta, quocumque idiomate, aut in posterum edere, aut edita legere vel retinere audeat, sub poenis in Indice librorum vetitorum indictis.

Quibus SANCTISSIMO DOMINO NOSTRO LEONI PAPAE XIII per me infrascriptum Secretarium relatis, SANCTITAS SUA Decretum probavit, et promulgari praecepit. In quorum fidem etc.

Datum Romae die 7 Iunii 1901.

ANDREAS *Card.* STEINHUBER, *Praefectus.*

Loco † Sigilli.

Fr. THOMAS ESSER, *Ord. Praed. a Secretis.*

Die 10 Iunii 1901. Ego infrascriptus Mag. Cursorum testor supradictum Decretum affixum et publicatum fuisse in Urbe.

VINCENTIUS BENAGLIA, *Mag. Curs.*

E S. CONGREGATIONE RITUUM.

PRIVILEGIA QUAE IN TRIDUO VEL OCTIDUO SOLEMNITER CELEBRANDO INTRA ANNUM A BEATIFICATIONE VEL CANONIZATIONE PER RESCRIPTUM SACRAE RITUUM CONGREGATIONIS A SUMMO PONTIFICE CONCEDI SOLENT.

I. In solemniis, sive triduanis pro recenter Beatificatis, sive octiduanis pro recenter Canonizatis, quae celebrari permittuntur,

Missae omnes, sive solemnes sive privatae, inter Votivas recensendae sunt. Ob peculiarem vero celebritatem Sanctitas Sua indulget, ut omnes ac singulae dicantur cum *Gloria* et *Credo;* semper autem habebunt Evangelium S. Ioannis in fine, iuxta Rubricas. Missa tamen solemnis dicatur cum unica Oratione: reliquae vero privatae cum omnibus commemorationibus occurrentibus, sed Collectis exclusis.

II. Missam solemnem impediunt tantum Duplicia primae classis, eiusdemque classis Dominicae, nec non feriae, vigiliae et octavae privilegiatae, quae praefata duplicia excludunt. Missas vero privatas impediunt etiam Duplicia secundae classis, et eiusdem classis Dominicae. In his autem casibus impedimenti, Missae dicendae sunt de occurrente festo, vel Dominica, aliisve diebus ut supra privilegiatis, prouti ritus diei postulat. In Duplicibus tamen primae classis addatur Orationi diei unica commemoratio de Beato vel Sancto sub unica conclusione: in duplicibus autem secundae classis Orationi de die, sub sua distincta conclusione, addantur in privatis Missis, praeter Orationem de Beato vel Sancto, omnes quas ritus exigit commemorationes occurrentes, Collectis, ut supaa, exclusis. Similiter in reliquis privilegiatis diebus Missae sint iuxta ritum diei, commemoratione de Beato vel Sancto semper suo loco addita. Quod Praefationem spectat serventur Rubricae.

III. In Ecclesiis, ubi adest onus celebrandi Missam Conventualem vel Parochialem cum applicatione pro populo, eiusmodi Missa de occurrente Officio nunquam omittenda erit.

IV. Si Pontificalia Missarum ad thronum fiant, haud Tertia canenda erit, Episcopo paramenta sumente, sed Hora Nona: quae tamen Hora minor de Beato vel Sancto semper erit, substitui nihilominus eidem Horae de die pro satisfactione non poterit.

V. Quamvis Missae omnes, vel privatae tantum, impediri possint, semper nihilominus secundas Vesperas de Beato vel Sancto solemniores facere licebit absque ulla commemoratione: quae tamen cum votivi rationem induant, pro satisfactione inservire non poterunt.

VI. Aliae functiones ecclesiasticae, praeter recensitas, de Ordinarii consensu, semper habere locum poterunt, uti Homilia inter Missarum solemnia, vel vespere Oratio panegyrica, analogae ad

Beatum vel Sanctum fundendae preces, Litaniae lauretanae, et maxime solemnis cum Venerabili Benedictio. Postremo vero Tridui vel Octidui die Hymnus *Te Deum* cum *Tantum ergo* et Orationibus de Ssmo Sacramento ac pro gratiarum actione sub unica conclusione, solemniter decantandus, nunquam omittetur.

VII. Ad venerationem autem et pietatem in novensiles Beatos vel Sanctos impensius fovendam, Sanctitas Sua, thesauros Ecclesiae aperiens, omnibus et singulis utriusque sexus christifidelibus qui vere poenitentes, confessi ac sacra synaxi refecti, ecclesias vel octiduana solemnia peragentur, visitaverint, ibique iuxta mentem eiusdem Sanctitatis Suae per aliquod temporis spatium pias ad Deum preces fuderint, indulgentiam plenariam in forma Ecclesiae consueta, semel lucrandam, applicabilem quoque animabus igne piaculari detentis, benigne concedit: iis vero qui corde saltem contrito, durante tempore enunciato, ipsas ecclesias vel oratoria publica inviserint, atque in eis uti supra oraverint, indulgentiam partialem centum dierum semel unoquoque die acquirendam, applicabilem pari modo animabus in purgatorio existentibus, indulget.

II.

Dubia quoad Litanias Lauretanas et Preces post Missam dicendas.

Rmus Dnus Franciscus Salesius Bauer, Episcopus Brunensis, a Sacrorum Rituum Congregatione sequentium dubiorum solutionem humiliter expostulavit; nimirum:

I. Utrum Litaniae Lauretanae post tertium *Agnus Dei* rite ac recte absolvi possint, addito statim versiculo, responsorio et oratione, vel inserto prius *Christe, audi nos* etc. prouti fit in Litaniis Sanctorum, cum *Pater* et *Ave* vel uno alterove?

II. Oratio ad S. Joseph, in mense Octobri ponenda est inter Rosarium et Litanias, as post Litanias rite absolutas?

III. Quandonam dicendae sunt cum populo preces post quamvis Missam sine cantu praescriptae, si S. Rosarium, Litaniae et oratio ad S. Joseph non eodem cum Missa momento finiunt?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, ad relationem subscripti Secretarii, audito voto Commissionis Liturgicae omnibusque perpensis respondendum censuit:

Ad I. Litaniae Lauretanae concludendae sunt uti in Appen-

dice Ritualis Romani, omissis *Christe, audi nos* etc.; versiculus autem, responsorium et oratio post dictas Litanias mutari possunt pro temporis diversitate.

Ad II. Oratio ad S. Joseph in fine Litaniarum Lauretanarum adiungi potest, juxta prudens arbitrium Episcopi.

Ad III. "Preces a SSmo D. N. Leone Papa XIII in fine Missae praescriptae recitandae sunt immediate, expleto ultimo Evangelio," ita ut aliae preces interponi nequeant, juxta decisionem S. R. C. in una *Basileen*, N. 3682, diei 23 Novembris 1887; et si, Missa absoluta, Rosarium a populo recitandum, non sit finitum, Celebrans dictas preces recitet cum Ministro solo.

Atque ita rescripsit. Die 7 Decembris 1900.

DOMINICUS *Card.* FERRATA *S. R. C. Praefectus.*

L. † S.

DIOMEDES PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen. S. R. C. Secrius.*

III.

URBIS ET ORBIS, QUOAD FESTUM S. JOANNIS BAPTISTAE DE LA SALLE.

Ad humillimas preces Rev. Fr. Robustiani, Procuratoris Generalis et Postulatoris Congregationis Fratrum Scholarum Christianarum, ab infrascripto Cardinali Sacro Consilio legitimis Ritibus cognoscendis ac tuendis Praefecto relatas, Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Leo Papa XIII, ex ipsius Sacrae Congregationis consulto, benigne concedere dignatus est, ut festum Sancti Joannis Baptistae de La Salle Conf., cum Officio et Missa de Communi Conf. non Pont., exceptis Oratione et Lectionibus secundi ac tertii Nocturni propriis, sub ritu duplici minori, die decimaquinta Maii, post annum 1902, ab universa Ecclesia quotannis recolatur; mandavitque ut Kalendario Universali ac novis editionibus Breviarii et Missalis Romani ejusmodi festum cum supradicto Officio ac Missa (de eodem Communi *Os justi* praeter Orationem et Evangelium) inscribatur, nec non elogium, prout huic praejacet Decreto, Martyrologio Romano inseratur. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Die 10 Februarii 1901.

DOMINICUS *Card.* FERRATA, *S. R. C. Praefectus.*

L. † S.

DIOMEDES PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen. S. R. C. Secrius.*

E SACRA CONGREGATIONE INDULGENTIARUM.

IN STATIONIBUS VIAE CRUCIS, CRUCES SUPER TABULIS DEPICTIS INTEGRE CONSPICUEQUE EMINERE DEBENT.

Procurator Generalis Congnis Sacerdotum a SS. Corde Iesu huic Sacrae Congni Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis exponit quod a plurimis annis in Gallia mos invaluerit erigendi stationes Viae Crucis cum crucibus ligneis supra quas, in conjunctione brachiorum tabellae depictae mysteria consueta repraesentantes applicantur; ita ut tantummodo extremitates brachiorum crucis appareant. Addendum est quod in ipso actu erectionis istarum stationum Viae Crucis, jam tabellae crucibus adhaerebant.

Cum hisce de erectionibus sic factis controversia exorta sit, ad omne dubium tollendum humillime quaerit orator:

Num erectiones stationum Viae Crucis de quibus supra, validae et licitae sustineri valeant?

Sacra vero Congregatio proposito dubio, audito unius ex Consultoribus voto, respondendum mandavit:

Affirmative prout exponitur: Verumtamen, cum juxta decreta (30 Jan. 1839; 23 Nov. 1878) Indulgentiae huius sacrosancti exercitii crucibus tantum sint adnexae, S. C. vehementer inculcat ut nihil innovetur, sed antiqua et ubique recepta praxis servetur, quae est ut cruces supra depictas tabellas integre conspicueque emineant.

Datum Romae ex Secr.ia ejusdem S. Congnis die 27 Martii 1901.

L. M. *Card.* PAROCCHI.

L. ✝ S.

FRANCISCUS, *Archiep. Amiden. Secrius.*

E S. CONGR. SUPER NEGOTIIS ECCLESIASTICIS EXTRAORDINARIIS.

DECLARATIO AUTHENTICA INDULTI DIEI 6 IULII 1899, SUPER IEIUNIO ET ABSTINENTIA PRO AMERICA LATINA.

Ex Audientia SS.mi diei 8 Martii 1901.

Ex parte nonnullorum Antistitum Americae Latinae, varia proposita fuerunt dubia circa vigorem et modum exsecutionis Indulti diei 6 Iulii 1899.

Sanctitas vero Sua, re mature perpensa et praehabito voto nonnullorum S. R. E. Cardinalium, referente me infrascripto

Sacrae Congregationis Negotiis Ecclesiasticis Extraordinariis praepositae Secretario, haec quae sequuntur declaranda et decernenda censuit; videlicet:

I. Verba "*fideles qui id petierint*," vigorem legis ecclesiasticae ieiunii et abstinentiae non iam sublatum, sed *pro singulis petentibus* mitigatum fuisse significant, ut patet etiam ex indulti verbis: "*servata ecclesiastica lege ieiunii et abstinentiae;*" ideoque dispensationem ab onere *petendi* indultum fidelibus imposito concedi non posse.

II. De speciali gratia conceditur, ut sufficiat petitio indulti facta a patre vel matrefamilias aliove familiae tum naturalis, tum moralis (ut collegii, diversorii et similium locorum) capite vel moderatore, dummodo agatur de viventibus sub eodem tecto vel de commensalibus. Et tum petitio tum concessio indulti, sive oretenus sive per litteras fiat, legitima habenda est; neque imponenda obligatio *Nummarii* specialis vel alterius documenti, ex quo constet de dispensatione obtenta deque dispensantis vel dispensati nomine.

III. Per indultum diei 6 Iulii 1899 nulla omnino mutatio facta est circa vigorem, usum et modum exsecutionis indultorum singulis ecclesiasticis Provinciis vel dioecesibus concessorum, et de istis indultis tantum intelligenda sunt, ideoque et de Bulla Cruciatae, ubi habeatur, verba eiusdem indulti: "*In singulis regionibus serventur conditiones quoad precum recitationem et eleemosynarum erogationem atque destinationem, hactenus in concessione indultorum pontificiorum servari solitae.*" Quapropter indultum diei 6 Iulii 1899, praeter petitionem a singulis fidelibus vel familiis ut supra faciendam, nullum adnexum habet onus eleemosynae vel pii operis, sed gratis omnino concedendum est.

IV. Cum indultum diei 6 Iulii 1899 sit vera extensio indultorum in singulis ecclesiasticis provinciis vel dioecesibus vigentium et statutis temporibus innovandorum, quamvis limitatum ad *singulos Fideles seu ad singulas familias petentes*, ut supra, non absorbet neque supprimit, sed potius supponit, imo praerequirit concessionem ac vigorem eorumdem indultorum, ac proinde observantiam conditionum iisdem indultis adnexarum. Idcirco publicatio annua indultorum, hucusque iuxta clausulas eorumdem, fieri solita, nullatenus omitti debet. Ad omnem vero confusionem evitandam, indultum diei 6 Iulii 1899 non promulgetur in corpore annui edicti de ieiunio et abstinentia, sed in fine tamquam appendix ad

idem edictum sub titulo: "*Ampliatio praecedentium indultorum pro singulis fidelibus seu familiis, qui illam petierint.*"

V. Quamvis Ordinarii in concedendo indulto diei 6 Iulii 1899 nullam taxam seu eleemosynam nullumque onus fidelibus imponere possint, et subdelegati nihil petere aut acceptare possint occasione dispensationum ab ipsis vi eiusdem indulti impertitarum; in ecclesiasticis tamen Provinciis ubi in promulgatione et usu indultorum nulla eleemosyna imponi consuevit, licitum erit Ordinariis, si id expedire iudicaverint, in corpore consueti edicti fideles hortari (excluso expressis verbis quolibet praecepto) ut sumptibus cultus divini et christinae beneficentiae pecuniariis eleemosynis concurrere pro viribus non omittant: ad quod in singulis ecclesiis parochialibus haberi poterit specialis capsa cum inscriptione: "*Eleemosynae voluntariae indulti quadragesimalis,*" vel statis diebus publica collectio in ecclesiis fieri.

VI. Diebus ieiunii, per indultum diei 6 Iulii 1899, quoad fideles vel familias qui illud petierint, dispensatis, non licet carnes cum piscibus permiscere. Et facultatem dispensandi a lege promiscuitatis, diebus, quoad ieiunium et abstinentiam dispensatis, non expedire.

VII. Religiosi utriusque sexus, speciali voto non obstricti, quamvis sint ex Ordine Minorum, de consensu suorum Superiorum ecclesiasticorum, uti possunt indulto diei 6 Iulii 1899 etiam quoad abstinentias et ieiunia in propria regula sive statutis praescripta. Hortandi tamen sunt Superiores Regulares, praesertim Provinciales et quasi Provinciales, ut pro viribus abstinere curent ab usu eiusdem indulti intra claustra: subditi vero stent iudicio suorum Superiorum.

Insuper SSmus Dominus benigne ad Americam Latinam extendere dignatus est privilegium Hispaniae a Pio IX fel. rec. concessum sub die 9 Novembris 1870, cuius virtute, quando festum Immaculatae Conceptionis B. M. V. inciderit in diem ieiunio consecratum, ieiunium transferri possit ad feriam V praecedentem.

Et super his omnibus Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Leo Divina Providentia Papa XIII praesens decretum edi mandavit et in acta Sacrae huius Congregationis referri. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Datum Romae, e Secretaria eiusdem S. C., die, mense et anno praedictis. Felix Cavagnis, *Secretarius.*

Conferences.

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW proposes to answer in this department questions of general (not merely local or personal) interest to the Clergy. Questions suitable for publication, when addressed to the editor, receive attention in due turn, but in no case do we pledge ourselves to reply to all queries, either in print or by letter.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

I.—APOSTOLIC LETTER to His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, Chancellor of the Catholic University of America, exhorting the Bishops to send students to that institution.

II.—S. CONGREGATION OF THE INDEX issues decree prohibiting certain recent works.

III.—S. CONGREGATION OF RITES:

1. Gives the privileges that are usually granted for the solemn celebration of triduums or octaves within the year of a Beatification or Canonization.
2. Answers certain doubts regarding the Litany of the Blessed Virgin, and the prayers after Mass.
3. Authorizes the insertion of the Feast of St. John Baptist de la Salle, Conf., in the universal Calendar.

IV.—S. CONGREGATION OF INDULGENCES requires that the Crosses attached to the pictures of the Stations be distinctly visible.

V.—S. CONGREGATION OF EXTRAORDINARY ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS gives the explanation of the indult for South America dispensing from fasts and abstinence under certain conditions.

SEARCHES INTO IRISH ORIGINS.

BY FATHER O'GROWNEY.

The late Rev. Eugene O'Growney, who died at Los Angeles, in the summer of 1899, is the author of a series of Irish text-books published under the auspices of the Gaelic League, which was organized in 1893 at Dublin, and which has since then spread in numerous branch societies throughout the United States and the British

Colonies. Among the papers of the deceased were found some sketches, evidently intended for publication, regarding the origin and development of Keltic terms and commonplaces, which are particularly interesting in view of the recent revival of Irish studies. Some of the views expressed by Father O'Growney may be disputed, and though the author is no longer in position to answer criticism, we shall gladly publish any statement from scholars of Irish antiquities likely to throw more light on topics which are for the most part closely bound up with the ecclesiastical history of Christian Europe. Dr. Richard Henebry, Professor of Keltic Languages and Literature at the Catholic University of America, has kindly revised the MS.

I.—IRELAND.

Words have their histories not less than nations and persons. Proper names especially are full of significance to those who study their meaning and origin. What is the meaning of the name of Ireland, and by whom was that name given? In what language did those speak who first gave Ireland her name, and what was the early history of that people?

There can be no doubt that the name Ireland is, partially at least, derived from a Teutonic language. The termination is the same as in Scotland, England, Iceland, Holland, Deutschland. And looking into history, we find that the present rulers of the country are Teutons; that they came first to Ireland in the twelfth century; that they also have control of Scotland, to which they gave its present name; and that they were at one time strangers to England, which now bears their tribal name, "the land of the Angles." So the termination of the name of Ireland, studied historically, brings us back to the time when Ireland and England received these names from the Teutons—that is to say, at least as far back as the year 407 A. D., when the Angles first invaded what was called Britain.

As England is the land of the Angles, and Scotland the land of the Scots, so Ireland was, to the Teuton, the land of the Iras. The word *Ira*, plural *Iras*, is the oldest Anglo-Saxon name we have for Irishman, and Iraland was the oldest form of the name Ireland. In German, the Irish are *die Iren* to the present day. From *Ira*, an Irishman, was formed the adjective *Irisc*, the Anglo-Saxon form of Irish. The word Erse—*i. e.*, Irish—has also survived, applied to the Gaelic language of Scotland, which is, of course, only a branch of Irish. This name Ira (Irishman) was formed by the Anglo-Saxons from the sound, as they grasped it,

of the name given to Ireland in the native Irish speech. The present native name of Ireland is *Eire*, familiar to most people in the form of Erin, which corresponds to the old Gaelic accusative form, *Erinn*. The name of Scotus Erigena, of whom we shall have something to say later, contains the name of Ireland in the form of *Eri;* and we often meet with this same form in poetry. Some Latin writers of the third and fourth centuries use the form *Iris*. Thus the root Ir—, which the Anglo-Saxons took to be the native name of Ireland, is not very far away from the real name.

A further step leads us to inquire: What is the meaning of this native name, *Erin?*

II.—Erin.

The older manuscript form of this name is *Eri*, genitive *Erenn*. A still older form is Erin (genitive Ierenn), and with this we may compare the Latin name Ierne, used by some early writers. Claudian, in the fourth century A. D., refers to an occasion

> Totum quam *Scotus Iernen*
> Movit . . .

Aristotle (384–322 B. C.) also had heard of Ireland, for he writes that "there are two islands, Albion and Ierne, beyond the Celtae." In those days, as we shall see, it had not entered into the head of any one to regard the Irish as of the Keltic race. The very earliest classical reference to Ireland that we have contains the name in the form Ierne. Onomæritus, who lived at the court of Pisistratus, King of Athens, in the sixth century before the Christian era, refers to the island Ierne. Side by side with this very old form, based on the Irish root Ierenn, we find, even as late as the time of Ptolemy (the third century B. C.), the full form Iouernia; and with this we may compare the Latin form, Iverna. Both these are evidently based on an earlier Irish form, Iverenn; and the Welsh and Breton names for Ireland, Iwerdon and Iverdon, confirm this. The omission of the *w* and *v* sounds, in the middle of words, will not seem strange to any one who remembers the Greek digamma of his school days. It is a very common occurrence in Irish—thus, Magivney and Mageeney are but two forms of the same name.

III.—HIBERNIA.

The oldest form of the native name of Ireland which we can trace is accordingly Iverin; and the oldest Latin form would properly be *Iverio*, genitive *Iverionis*. Any one who has lived in a Spanish-speaking district of the United States must have noticed the common interchange of *v* and *b* sounds.[1] By such an interchange arose the form Iberia, which we find, with *h* prefixed, in the Confessions of St. Patrick—*Hiberione*, in the ablative case. The Saint also used the word *Hiberionaces* for the Irish people. The Latin form *Iberna* was based on this root. It is used by classical writers of the second century of this era.

There can be no doubt that in the early part of the Christian era the climate of Northern Europe was much colder than it now is. The description of the winter in Gaul, as given by Cæsar, would almost apply to the Greenland of the present day. The early Latin writers represent Ireland as an exceedingly cold country in winter time. Claudian, a writer of the fourth century, speaks of *glacialis Ierna;* and it was this idea that brought them to give the name Ireland a Latin etymology and to call it *Hibernia*, or the wintry land, from *hibernus*, wintry. There is not a very great difference between Iberna and Hibernia, and the classical writers soon supplied the required etymology. The Tartar people of Asia, in an exactly similar way, received the name of Tartars, from some fancied connection with the Latin word *Tartarus*. Hibernia, a name so long and so intimately associated with Ireland, is, etymologically, a misnomer.

This form Hibernia is used by Pliny (23–79 A. D.), who adds that there were, in his time, no snakes in Ireland. Solinus, about 250 A. D., makes the same remark. These assurances seem to discredit the story that St. Patrick banished the serpent from Ireland.[2]

[1] The Mexicans of Arizona, for instance, say *ben* for *ven*, come; *beinte* for *veinte*, twenty, etc. The Americans on occupying Manila, shortly after its capture, recognized under the local name *Beerheenia* a dance that originated in Virginia and took its name from there.

[2] Dr. Kuno Meyer suggests that the legend first arose among the Scandinavian invaders of Ireland in the tenth century. The name Patrick might have seemed equivalent to the words, in their own tongue, *padda-rekr*, or toad expeller; from which name the legend may have been constructed.

But what is the meaning of the oldest proper form *Iveria*, genitive *Iverionos?* There can be hardly any doubt about the first syllable; it is the word *ivarn*, later *iarn*, western.[3] This word has also the meaning of backwards, back. For some reason or other the same word in Irish stands for backwards and westwards, forwards and eastwards, right-hand and south, left-hand and north.

The Greeks, looking at the name *Ierne*, interpreted it through their own tongue as "Holy Isle," *hierenesos*. And as the Irish people were known to be a religious race and distinguished for religious observances, it is not unlikely that the Greek historians based their interpretation of Ireland's original name upon this fact. A people remarkable, even before Christian times, for its chivalry and spirit of hospitality, may have rightly deserved that its country should be called "Holy," yet the interpretation of Ierne given by the Greeks was none the less a forced one. The true name of Ireland, "Western Land," was geographically most appropriate; all the more since those who gave Ireland her name, came to it from the East, as we shall see.

In the native literature we find the Irish people called by a poetic name, *fir fuinid*, or men of the sunset.[4] There can be little doubt that "western land" was the meaning of the original forms of Iverin, Ierin, Erin. But what is the second element of the name is not quite agreed upon. Zeuss, whose opinion is of high authority, suggests that it is the word *rend*, a division or district.

In the sixth century B. C., as we have seen, the true name of Ireland had already been much contracted from *Iverion* to *Ierne*. But the name by which Ireland was known to Europe during the most brilliant period of her history, was Scotia, now recognized as the Latin for Scotland.[5]

[3] Avienus in the fourth century A. D. writes:

> Ast in duobus in Sacram, sic insulam
> Dixere prisci, solibus cursus rata est,
> Haec inter undas multa cespitem jacit,
> Eamque late gens Hibernorum colit.

[4] This word, *fuinid*, sunset, although it does not occur in Irish literature for several centuries back, is still in common use on the coast line from Clare to Donegal.

[5] The name *Hêriu*, gen. *Hêrenn*, is now recognized as the representate of an Old-Keltic *Hiverio*, gen. *Hiverionos*. Speculation as to its etymological signification gives no satisfactory results.—Ed.

SCOTIA.

The Scotch are proverbially a canny, thrifty people. They have a "taking way" with them; and among other things they have appropriated the name of England, which they use in Gaelic as the name of their own country, and also the old name of Ireland, Scotia, which after having been used first in Latin for North Britain, gave a basis for the present name, Scotland. The name to which Scotland has undisputed right is Caledonia, yet that term is rarely met with outside of poetry. The colonists who went from Scotland to northern Canada gave their new country the name of Nova Scotia; and Scotia itself has been looked upon as the proper name of Scotland since the twelfth century, or perhaps a little earlier. Before that date Scotland was called *Scotia Minor*, to distinguish it from *Scotia Major*, which stood for Ireland. The name, therefore, originally belonged to Ireland. And when in 503 A.D. a colony of Irish people moved into Scotland, to the district which is still called Argyle, that is, *Oirear Gædheal*, the district of the Gael or Irish, the name Scotia was applied to this colony, which, whilst it grew in numbers and extended itself very much territorially, remained distinct from the previous inhabitants of Scotland, the Picts. But in 843 A.D. the Scots or Irish and the Picts amalgamated under one king, and by degrees the name Scot and Scotia was used to designate all Scotland and its people.

The Irish monasteries of Iona, Lisnure, and others were the main centres of intellectual and religious activity in Scotland up to the tenth or the eleventh century, and the name of Scotus was understood throughout all Europe as equivalent to Irishman. The Schotten-Kloster, or schools founded in Germany by Irish missionaries and teachers, still bear testimony to this fact, and the manuscripts in numerous German libraries, and described in the catalogues as *Scottice scripti*, are simply written in Irish. Many Irishmen, such as Marianus Scotus (1028–1082), Duns Scotus (1265–1308), Macarius Scotus, abbot of Würzburg (1153), and John Scotus, also called Erigena and Scotigena, bear in their names a proof of the meaning of Scotia, as it was then understood by the learned world. These "merchants of wisdom," and "soul friends," teachers and missionaries, were Irishmen. John

Scotus or Erigena flourished in the ninth century, and is thought by some to have been the scholar who was called to assist in establishing the studies of Oxford, then beginning its career.[6] Palladius was known as Bishop "to the Scots who believed in Christ," that is, to the Irish. This was before St. Patrick's time. And the classical writers of still earlier times use the name Scotia of Ireland.

In Scotland, therefore, before 503 A.D. there were no Scots. The people of the northeast coast were called Picts, a name which the Romans interpreted through Latin as meaning painted, but which more probably was a word in their own language, identical or cognate with the name of the Pictevi or Pictonos in Gaul. They spoke a language akin to the Irish, and more nearly akin in all probability to the Gaulish. But only a few words of their speech have come down to us. After the ninth century the Irish Gaelic spread over all the highlands, and is still spoken there by about 400,000 people. To the Irish the Picts were known as *Cruithnigh*, a Pictish word no doubt.[7] Before the invasion of Scotland by the Irish colony in 503, Scotland was known to the British, or at least to the Romans in Britain, as Caledonia, a name which is probably from the British or Welsh word *Celydda*, wood, a wooded country. It would not be true to say that it was not until the sixth century that the Irish became acquainted with Scotland. We find from the native Gaelic literature that Cuchullin, seven centuries earlier, knew the Isle of Skye, where, indeed, his memory remains in the name of the Coolin Hills. The tragic story of the Sons of Usna was played out partially in Scotland. We again meet with Scotland in the Irish annals of King Dathe's time. But it was the sixth century colonization, and especially the passing of Columkille across the Moyle that gave to North Britain the name of Scotia Minor, and eventually the name of Scotland. The name Scotia accordingly came from Ireland; and we must look to the Irish language for the explanation of it.

[6] He was a man of considerable wit. A certain king opposite whom he was sitting one day at table, asked him, "Quid distat inter Scottum et sottum?" "Mensa tantum," was the quick reply. Some regard this as a proof that he was not from Scotia Minor.

[7] *Cruithnech* is the Irish form of the word found in *ynys Prydain*, the Island of Britain. Both descend from *qrtnos*, the Old-Keltic name of Britain.—ED.

The Normans, of a later period, do not appear very prominently as a distinct race in the Irish annals. Up to the present day the speakers of Irish call the English the Saxons, and the expression "Among the Saxons" is equivalent to "in England." With the Normans and the Saxons there also came into Ireland some of the primitive people of Britain, the British as they are called even yet in Irish—*Breathnach.*

In the fifth century, when the Angles came into England, they found there before them the Britons, speaking a language different from their own. Now the Teutons have a word which they apply to persons using a foreign speech, the word *walh.* This, according to Professor Max Müller, was the old German form. The Anglo-Saxon was *wealh*, a person who cannot speak intelligibly. The adjective was *weälisc;* from which the English word "Welsh" was formed. When the Anglo-Saxons called the old Britons "the Welsh," they simply meant that the Britons spoke a strange language, just as the Greeks called the Barbarians "speechless," and the Poles called the Germans "dumb," and as the Irish said, and say, of a person who lisps, that he speaks after the British manner, *Go bristach.* So to-day *waelschland* in German means Italy; *Waelsch* is given in the dictionaries as standing for "French, Italian, foreign," and walnut is foreign-nut.[8] The word "Welsh" is accordingly a German word. The Germans spell it with an *ä* or *ae*, *Wälsch* or *Waelsch*, pronouncing it *Welsh.* When some of the native Britons crossed over into Ireland with the Normans and Saxons and settled there, their descendants were called *Breathnach* or British by the native Irish; and Welsh by the English-speaking Normans and Saxons. Hence arose the surname Welsh. For a long time people adhered to the traditional pronunciation represented by Welsh and Welch; subsequently in the United States arose the phonetic pronunciation Wôlsh.

[8] *Waelsch* is the Keltic tribe-name *Volci*, whose tongue the Germans did not understand. *Vide* Kluge, *Woerterbuch*, in voc.—ED.

Cf. the German *Waelsch-hahn*, a turkey, and note how in Irish *Gall* has come to mean foreigner; and how the word for the modern Gaulish or French is now used in Irish as *Walsh* is in German; so that a turkey cock is called a French cock—*coileach-Francach.*

The names of Britain, Britons, by which England and its pre-Saxon inhabitants were known to the world at large, is supposed to be akin to the Welsh word *brith*, painted. *Brit*, a Briton, is found in early Irish literature, and has given rise to the surname Brit or Brett. Brittany, in northwestern France, and the Breton language yet spoken there, are of the same origin, as a colony went from Britain to France after the Anglo-Saxons had driven the Britons westward. This immigration occurred about the time when the Dalriadans went from Ireland to Scotland, that is, in the beginning of the sixth century. The Breton thus bears the same relation to Welsh as Scotch-Gaelic does to Irish. Although separated for many centuries, the Scotch and Irish still understand each other's language without much difficulty. The same is true of the Bretons and the Welsh.

The Welsh, or ancient British language, and the Irish likewise bear a certain similarity, although not so readily apparent as in the case of Scotch and Irish. The language spoken to-day in the Isle of Man, as one might expect, is not very different from Scotch or Irish Gaelic.

If we go back, then, to pre-Roman times in Britain—say to the year 100 B.C.—we shall find in Scotland the Picts, and in England the Britons, speaking two dialects of the same language. Scotland, as has been said, was known to the Britons as *Calido* or *Celido*, the wooded country; and the whole island of Britain was known to the outer world as *Albion*, a name derived either from the Latin *albus*, white, or the Irish *alp*, a mountain. The white cliffs of England, which strike the sailor approaching from France, supply a reason for the first explanation. In that case we must assume that the name was given to England by the Romans, and that it was then adopted by the Irish. There is equally good authority for deriving the name from *alp*, a mountain. Whatever be the explanation, there can be no doubt that the pre-Norman inhabitants of Britain, both Picts and British, were in language and race akin to the Irish people of the same period.

(To be continued.)

ANENT THE SUBJECT OF SACRAMENTAL CAUSALITY.

[It will be remembered in connection with the above title that the Rev. Dr. MacDonald, of St. Francis Xavier's College, Antigonish, Nova Scotia, wrote for our May number, 1900, a paper entitled "The Sacramental Channels of Divine Grace." Again, in the June issue of the same year, we published from the same pen an article on "Sacramental Causality," in which Dr. MacDonald maintained, as the teaching of St. Thomas, that the sacraments are instrumental causes of grace itself; that they immediately produce sanctifying grace as their principal effect, and that their instrumentality is of the physical type. He thus combated the position of Father Billot, S.J., senior professor of theology in the Gregorian University at Rome, who holds that St. Thomas teaches that the sacraments are instrumental causes, not of grace itself, but of a disposition of the soul necessitating, if no obstacle be put in the way, the grant of grace by the Holy Ghost, and that the sacraments are therefore only mediate and disposing causes of grace, their efficiency belonging to the intentional order, not the physical. In the January number of this year, the Rev. Dr. Cronin, Vice-Rector of the English College, Rome, a disciple of the eminent Roman professor, took occasion of Dr. MacDonald's articles to set forth the doctrine of the dispositive causality of the sacraments. A reply to this article was made by Dr. MacDonald in the February issue, Dr. Cronin's rejoinder appearing in our April REVIEW. In May the concluding portion of Dr. Cronin's main exposition of Father Billot's position appeared. Now Dr. MacDonald makes reply to the rejoinder and the second article of Dr. Cronin.

It has been found impossible, owing to the distance apart of the writers, and the constant pressure on our space, to bring the several parts of the discussion in consecutive months.—EDITOR.]

No author is at greater pains to express his mind clearly, or is more accurate in his use of words, than St. Thomas. Now, in his earlier work, the *Commentary on the Sentences*, he distinctly says that the sacraments are not instrumental causes of grace, except in a qualified sense, namely, in so far as they produce a disposition in the soul which carries grace with it if there be no obstacle on the part of the recipient.[1] In the *Quaest. Disp. de Veritate*[2] on the one hand, and repeatedly in the *Summa Theologica*,[3] he affirms categorically that the sacraments are instrumental causes of grace. If this be "reiteration," the word has lost its old meaning.

"One is not to be regarded," says Father Billot, at page 70 of his work, "as taking back what has once been set down, unless one declares so expressly, or at least puts forward a view which

[1] Dist. 1, q. 1, a. 4; Dist. 18, q. 1, a. 3.

[2] De Gratia, a. 4, ad 2.

[3] 3ª., q. 62, a. 1; *ib.* a. 1, ad 2; *ib.* a. 3 et a. 4. *Cf.* also q. 66, a. 5, ad 3; q. 75, a. 4; q. 77, a. 2, ad 2; q. 72, a. 4, also ad 1; *ib.* a. 5.

contradicts and excludes the former view." I accept this test, and proceed to cite a passage from the *Summa* where St. Thomas lays down a doctrine respecting the causality of the sacraments which contradicts and excludes the view put forward in a perfectly parallel passage of his *Commentary on the Sentences.* The title of the article in which this passage occurs is, "Has Christ empowered the ministers [of Baptism] to coöperate in the work of cleansing the soul?" The Saint answers:

There are four ways of coöperating with an agent: (1) by assisting; (2) by giving counsel; (3) by serving as the medium through which he produces the effect, as instruments coöperate with a principal agent; (4) by disposing the matter to receive the effect of the principal agent. No created being can coöperate with God in either of the first two ways . . . In the third way, creatures coöperate with God in some of His works, though not in all . . There are some things which God reserves to Himself, which He immediately effects, and in these no creature can coöperate with Him as His instrument. But in the fourth way, a creature can coöperate with Him, as we see in the creation of the human soul, which God Himself immediately creates, while a natural agent disposes the matter for its reception. And as the re-creation of the soul corresponds to its creation, God immediately effects the work of sanctifying it; and no man coöperates with Him in this work as His instrument. But as disposing the soul to receive grace, men do coöperate with Him, both *ex opere operantis*, by instruction or the performance of meritorious works, and *ex opere operato*, by administering the sacraments, which dispose the soul for the reception of grace, through which sin is remitted.[4]

The title of the article in the *Summa*, where we find the parallel passage, is, "Is it God alone who produces the interior effect of the sacraments?" Here is the answer:

A cause produces an effect in one of two ways: (1) as the principal agent; (2) as an instrument. God alone produces the interior effect of the sacraments in the first way. For God alone comes into the soul where the interior effect of the sacrament is. Moreover, grace, which is the interior effect of the sacrament, is from God alone. The character, too, which some of the sacraments imprint, is an instrumental virtue derived from God as principal agent. But in the second way, man may help to produce the interior effect of the sacrament by acting as the minister. For the minister plays the part of an instrument. The action of both is applied externally, but produces the internal effect by the power of God, the principal agent.[5]

It will be observed that St. Thomas here makes the minister, as well as the sacrament, to be God's instrument in conferring grace. In the *Commentary on the Sentences*,[6] he speaks of Bap-

[4] D. 5, q. 1, a. 2.
[5] 3ª., q, 64, a. 1.
[6] Dist. 18, q. 1, a. 3.

tism as the inanimate instrument, and of the minister as the living instrument of God. And in fact, the acts of the minister in pronouncing the words of the form and applying the matter (where this is done), are bound up, by the indissoluble bond of physical connection, with the sensible sign or sacrament. What, therefore, is affirmed of the minister, is affirmed, in like manner, of the sacrament; and conversely. Now, there is affirmed in set terms of the minister, in this passage from the *Summa*, what is denied in set terms of the minister in the passage from the *Commentary on the Sentences*. In the latter, the Saint says expressly that the minister does coöperate with God as His instrument in producing grace. But it is by administering the sacrament that the minister coöperates with God as His instrument in this work. Therefore, as often as St. Thomas declares in the *Summa* that God uses the sacraments as instruments in producing grace—and he does so over and over again—so often does he contradict and exclude the view put forward in his earlier work. He does so not less effectually than Father Billot himself contradicts and excludes, in his present work on the sacraments, the theory of sacramental causality he upheld in an earlier work,[7] where he maintained that the sacraments "as instruments of the physical type, either produce grace itself in a subject that is here and now disposed, or at least leave in an indisposed subject a title that exacts grace when the obstacle is removed,—quatenus per virtutem physicam instrumentalem vel efficiunt gratiam ipsam in subjecto hic et nunc disposito, vel saltem in indisposito relinquunt titulum exigitivum gratiae ad obicis remotionem" (pp. 113, 114). The only difference is that in the one case, the change of view is a distinct advance; in the other, it is retrogression.

And here the matter might rest. But, in order to remove even the shadow of a doubt regarding the mind of St. Thomas, I will now deal briefly with the Rev. Dr. Cronin's contention that the Saint, in the *Summa*, "positively supposes the dispositive causality of the sacraments." He bases his contention, first, upon what is said respecting the revival of Baptism. Now, the Saint does not say that grace is the "*effectus formae*," meaning by form

[7] *De Sacramentis in Genere*. Romae, in Pontificia Universitate Gregoriana. Anno 1885-1886. The copy of this work that lies before me is in lithograph.

the baptismal character. Rather does he make grace the *quasi* effect of the character, seeing that he describes the character itself as "*quasi formam.*"[8] The analogy of Baptism with natural generation, which he here makes use of, is not to be pressed too far; else we shall make the Saint contradict himself. For he elsewhere[9] refers to the character as the "other effect" of the sacraments, grace being the "principal."[10] And he teaches that the instrumental virtue which is in the character does but dispose the soul "remotely or indirectly" to receive grace. "Directly and proximately," he says, "the character disposes the soul for the performance of acts relating to the worship of God. And because these acts cannot be fittingly performed without the help of divine grace, God in His bounty accordingly bestows grace on those who receive the character, that they may worthily fulfil the duties to which they are called."[11]

We find fault with Protestants for taking isolated texts of Scripture—"chips and fragments," Newman calls them—and building on these a theory of religion. The mind of St. Thomas is no more to be gathered from bits and scraps of his writings than is the mind of the sacred writer from those "chips and fragments."

In the second place, Dr. Cronin tells us that, "in any other theory [than that of dispositive causality] it is impossible to explain why it is that the sacraments which imprint a character upon the soul cannot be repeated." St. Thomas gives as many as four different reasons why Baptism is not to be repeated.[12] And not one of the four is the same as that which is assigned by Dr. Cronin. The third of the Saint's reasons is that Baptism imprints a character on the soul—which is the one and sufficient reason given by the Tridentine Fathers why neither it, nor Holy Orders, nor Confirmation can be repeated.[13] But is it precisely because the character as "the title to grace is always present, and will be always fruitful of grace, provided the recipient be

[8] 3ª., q. 70, a. 10, c.
[9] 3ª., q. 63.
[10] 3ª., q. 62.
[11] 3ª., q. 63, a. 4, ad 1.
[12] 3ª., q. 66, a. 9.
[13] Sess. 7, Can 9.

worthy?" No; for this would only serve to explain why the sacrament need not be repeated—not why it cannot be repeated. Wherein, then, does the reason consist? It consists in this, that the character is "indelible, and given with a certain consecration. Hence, as other consecrations are not repeated in the Church, neither is Baptism repeated."[14] The simple fact itself that they imprint a character, is the reason why the sacraments that do imprint it are not to be repeated. For whenever they are validly received they imprint a character. Consequently, to give a sacrament a second time would be to imprint a second character—a proceeding as futile as would be the reconsecration of a church that had never lost its first consecration.

If Baptism could confer grace without imprinting a character, as it can and does imprint a character without conferring grace, then it might be repeated in order to imprint the character. But why can't it? And how can it be valid but unfruitful? To the production of one or both of the two distinct effects of Baptism the person to be baptized may put an obstacle. If he be in mortal sin, and will not repent, he puts an obstacle to grace, since grace and mortal sin cannot coexist. Yet he may have the will to become a member of the Church by Baptism, and if so, puts no obstacle to the other effect of the sacrament, which will be so far forth valid. But if he have not the will to be baptized, and yet go through the form of receiving Baptism, he frustrates the sacrament of both its effects, and makes it wholly null and void. He received neither grace nor the character, because no one who has attained the use of reason can become a member of the Church, receive the character of a child of God, or receive the grace of God, without his own voluntary act. "Quotquot autem receperunt eum, dedit eis potestatem filios Dei fieri" (John 1: 12). The will to be received into the grace and friendship of God, in the case of one who has never been baptized, necessarily implies the will to receive the sacrament of Baptism; but not conversely.[15]

To put this another way: As one can be a Christian without being a good Christian, so one can have the will to become a

[14] *Loc. cit.*

[15] Council of Trent, Sess. 6, chap. 4.

Christian without having the will to become a good Christian. Hence, the will to receive the grace of Baptism, by which one becomes a good Christian, necessarily implies the will to become a Christian; but not conversely.

There remains to be explained why Baptism cannot confer grace—and the same is true of Confirmation and Holy Orders—without at the same time imprinting a character. Dr. Cronin takes it for granted that it might do so, for he says: "if it were true that the character and the sacramental grace were equally immediate effects of the sacrament, its repetition, while leaving the character intact, would undoubtedly give an increase of the sacramental grace, this being indefinitely augmentable." But the Council of Trent clearly implies that this could not be; for it assigns as the reason why none of the three sacraments can be repeated the simple fact that they imprint an indelible character. Let us see if some explanation of this cannot be found.

All the sacraments have in common the effect of producing grace. Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy Orders have, besides, for their special and proper effect, the imprinting of a character: Baptism, the character of a Christian; Confirmation, the character of a soldier of Christ; Holy Orders, the character of a priest of God. Now an instrument, if it be used at all, must needs produce its proper effect, though it may come short of the effect it has in common with other instruments. For instance, the spoken word has for its proper effect to express an idea as the instrument of the mind. In common with other sounds it produces an impression on the ear. This, however, it may fail to do from some cause or other, say deafness. But if the word is spoken at all, it expresses the idea—that is to say, it produces its proper effect. So with the sacraments that imprint a character. Given the conditions requisite for their valid administration, they must needs produce their proper effect—in other words, imprint an indelible character on the soul.

And now I have before me Dr. Cronin's Rejoinder. As space is limited and it is deemed desirable that the discussion should not be prolonged, some minor issues will be passed over and the major ones dealt with but very briefly.

In paragraph five Dr. Cronin uses the word "physical" in its narrow sense. I was at the pains to state plainly that I was using

it in the wide sense, in which the intentional image produced in the internal sense, reproduced in the imagination, and finally, by the action of the *intellectus agens*, in the intellect, is, viewed as an affection of the mind, an entity of the physical order. In paragraph seven, he complains that by introducing the terms "moral" and "moral causality" and applying them to Father Billot's theory, I "confuse and obscure the issue." But is not Father Billot the one who has introduced a term to darken counsel? Until he gets philosophers to adopt his division of efficient cause into physical, moral, and intentional, he must learn to bear with those who look upon an efficient cause which is not of the physical type as being of the moral type. It is idle to tell us that a right and title to grace creates a necessity for the production of grace as real as any physical necessity. So does the right and title of a servant to his hire create as real a necessity for the paying of it by the master as the use of force compelling him to pay. But the necessity is of the moral order; and it does not cease to be moral in the case of the sacrament by calling it "intentional."

But, argues Dr. Cronin, the reception of a valid sacrament is transient, and cannot be the right and title to grace; the disposition remains, and can. The answer is: (1) in ordinary cases the grace is conferred simultaneously with the sacrament; (2) in case of an *obex*, the valid reception is still a reality known and remembered by God. It is, as it were, the word of God pledged to give the grace, instead of His written promise, to which the disposition may be likened. It is true that man's word is not always as good as his bond, but God's is.

As the net result of the elaborate and subtle reasoning of paragraphs seven and eight we have the conclusion that the sacrament is the dispositive instrumental cause of grace, not the instrumental cause in its strict and proper sense, without limitation or qualification of any sort. At any rate this is precisely what Father Billot holds, and I take it that Dr. Cronin does not aim at proving the sacrament to be the instrumental cause in the strict and proper sense—which is what Father Billot's opponents hold it to be. This conclusion will be examined presently in the light of what the Council of Trent teaches.

Dr. Cronin assumes without warrant that, because St. Thomas,

in his *De Veritate*, speaks of the sacraments as *instrumenta disponentia*, he must needs mean that they produce immediately only a disposition to grace and not grace itself. An instrument by its very nature acts by disposing, but its operations need not stop short at producing the disposition. Besides, as Dr. Paquet observes, in his latest work:[16] "Nomine dispositionis non intelligitur necessario aliquod inchoative ingrediens essentiam effectus, at generalius accipitur 'omne praeveniens' (Cajet)."

But why follow a roundabout way when the goal may be gained by a short cut? "Is a dispositive instrumental cause an instrumental cause, or is it not?" asks Dr. Cronin. A dispositive instrumental cause, I make answer, is a dispositive instrumental cause. To speak of it as an instrumental cause without adding the qualifying word "dispositive" would be utterly misleading. Hence the care with which St. Thomas distinguishes in his *Commentary on the Sentences*, between an instrumental cause properly so-called and a merely dispositive instrumental cause. When you say instrumental cause of grace, you are supposed to mean an instrument *simpliciter dictum*, not an instrument *secundum quid*, one, viz., that is such only in a qualified and restricted sense. Now, I stand on the teaching of the Council of Trent, which affirms that Baptism is, not the "dispositive instrumental cause," nor yet the "(dispositive) instrumental cause," but the "instrumental cause" of justification, and therefore of grace. The expression used by the Council is, I submit, the *norma loquendi* for theologians in this matter—"the form of sound words" which the Apostle has made obligatory upon all. What right has Fr. Billot, or Dr. Cronin, or any one else to limit the meaning of these words? If the exigencies of the theory require that the language of the Council be qualified or restricted instead of being taken in the meaning it bears on its face, so much the worse for the theory. So long as Fr. Billot's teaching does not permit those who uphold it to speak of Baptism precisely, without hedging or restriction, as the instrumental cause of justification, it is bootless for Dr. Cronin to protest that there is not the slightest discrepancy between it and the teaching of the Council.

Antigonish, Nova Scotia. ALEX. MACDONALD, D.D.

[16] *De Sacramentis*, p. 58.

CLERICS THE PREY OF COMMERCIAL SPECULATORS.

One of our Bishops, himself an excellent business manager, writes to ask us to insert in the REVIEW a warning to the clergy against sharp speculators who allure priests into bargains and enterprises which are mere frauds, and designed to obtain money from credulous and inexperienced persons. Numerous circulars of every description, inviting priests to the purchase of abnormally cheap church goods, patent medicines, liquors, "standard libraries," lands, and real estate; also stock reports and quotations; offers of mine, and railway shares; and investments of every description, are regularly mailed to priests who, trusting the plausible advances, put up sums of money which are invariably thrown away to the sharpers who make a trade of decoying the unwary into their toils.

There is probably no class of men more apt to become a ready prey to fraudulent agents and speculators than the Catholic priest. Fresh from the seminary, where he has been confined for from six to ten years, he emerges into a position of responsibility, the exercise of which requires more than ordinary discretion. Compared to the average man of the world who can hold his own in business, the young priest presents a striking contrast, the main characteristics of which are:

1. He has little or no knowledge of the practical world around him, because he has had no experience with men who might have made him cautious.

2. He feels the consciousness of superior knowledge, which is often of little practical use, keeps him in darkness about his real ignorance, and stimulates his vanity by its exceptional character.

3. He is almost immediately placed in a position of trust which makes him his own chief counsellor at a time when he might profit by the suggestions of some of his humblest parishioners.

4. He is nearly always enabled to carry into effect his own immature projects; and he can do this at the expense of the congregation without being amenable to correction or personal loss for whatever folly he may commit.

5. He is not only, as a rule, convinced that his authority is

absolute and irresponsible, but he is also assured of his own wisdom through the flattery of those who have nothing to lose by deceiving him.

With such dangers arising out of his very position and apart from any personal guilt or wilful neglect, a priest needs all the caution which prudent advice can give him; and he is simply foolish, if not criminally responsible, if he invests his own money or the money he holds in trust, in any scheme that is not clearly honorable and approved by those who have a right to know.

The moral law permits interest on invested funds; for the ecclesiastical legislation concerning usury is directed against excess and injustice. But the same legislation positively forbids clerics to engage in what is commonly called the operation of speculators, or commercial gambling. When, moreover, such operations are indulged in without knowledge of the risks involved, and simply upon the representation of smoothly-written circulars, or with funds that ought to be sacred, because they are a congregation's trust,—then they not only violate the law of the Church, and dishonor the priesthood, but they also burden the conscience with most serious responsibility. The priestly calling prohibits the squandering of money upon unworthy objects, and the neglect of that prohibition frequently entails restitution the more difficult to make because it asserts its right in indefinite ways, which become clear only at the hour of death.

CHURCHES ON WHEELS.

Since we mentioned, in our issue for June, the subject of chapel-cars as an enterprise which might commend itself to the Catholic missionary, no less than it does to the zealous proselytizers who are using it to ready advantage for the dissemination of the Protestant gospel, there has appeared in the *Saturday Evening Post* an illustrated article on the subject by Mr. Forrest Crissey. He tells us that "modern methods in religious activity have crowded the plodding old pioneer of the Gospel from the beaten trail of his circuit," and that the "church on wheels" already moves along the rails of more than sixty big Western roads. One society alone (the American Baptist Publication So-

ciety) has six of these chapel-cars, with elaborate equipment, in constant operation. It appears that a chapel-car syndicate was organized in Wall Street, New York, as early as 1890, and supplied all the movable chapels for the Northwest.

There are half a dozen chapel-cars at work to-day in neglected towns from the plains of Texas and Arizona to the frontier hamlets of Montana and Washington. And as a result "more than ninety churches have been organized and seventy-five pastors settled by the visits of these six chapel-cars."

Looking at the subject merely from the point of practical usefulness, as affording to the missionary the opportunity to reach in some systematic way the people from whom he is otherwise debarred, there seems no reason why the chapel-car should not serve the priest even more effectively than it does the Baptist or Methodist mission societies. Mr. Crissey tells us that many persons are attracted to the preaching in the chapel-car who otherwise would never go to any service, but who thereby soon become members of a newly organized mission. "Scores of engineers, stokers, conductors, brakemen, and men of all ranks, who are strangers to the inside of a church, eagerly attend the chapel-car meeting."

"Some of the chapel-cars are supplied with a stereopticon. There are scenes from the Holy Land and reproductions of the best paintings of Scriptural subjects." Surely all this is good for us to use, in order to spread God's teaching; for it is mainly a question of bringing together the people for the purpose of devotion and spiritual enlightenment.

Moreover, some of the means of raising funds for the building of a permanent church in a new settlement are readily afforded by these chapel-cars, without making it necessary to rent "Odd Fellows' Halls" or to turn church basements into temporary amusement saloons. "On the other hand," says the writer of the article referred to above, "the management of the chapel-cars follows the rule that they shall not be used for exhibition purposes, and that they shall be sent only to towns where there are few, if any, churches. . . . If a public reception is held in a chapel-car it is only on the day of its departure. . . . The effort is constantly made to put the railway authorities and employees to as little in-

convenience as possible in the movement of these cars, which are generally hauled by the slower trains—and invariably without charge. . . . Occasionally the crew of the gospel car is called to leave the standard-gauge track and go up into the mines by a narrow-gauge line equipped with dummy cars. Hundreds of Indians have listened to the message of the chapel-car evangelist."

The idea is surely not a bad one; and as a matter of method it should recommend itself most to those who have the best kind of missionary teaching to disseminate—in places where methods of permanent organization are not available or still remote.

THE BLESSING IN ARTICULO MORTIS.

To the Editor of AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

In the June number of the REVIEW a writer, under the *nom de plume* of "Vicarius," questions the accuracy of certain statements of mine, which appeared in a previous number, on the above subject, and expresses his opinion that they are calculated to create confusion. With all due deference to my Reverend critic, I fear his remarks can have no other result than that of making confusion (if there be any) worse confounded.

The cardinal point which he assails and which calls for comment in this communication is the assertion that "the last blessing is not repeated even though the patient be in mortal sin at the time it is imparted." I supported my statement by a quotation from Konings-Putzer's *Commentarium in Fac. Ap.*, 1897, p. 258, which reads thus: "Hinc in eadem infirmitate licet diuturna eam semel tantum impertiri *licet*, etsi infirmus eam accepit in statu peccati mortalis . . . juxta Resp. S. C. Ind. 12 Martii 1855, n. 362, in quo refertur ad Resp. die 5 Feb. 1841, n. 286."

"Vicarius" (following his authorities) denies that the blessing *in articulo mortis* given to one in mortal sin is valid, and he contends that it must therefore be repeated, should that person recover the state of grace. He bases his contention on a passage from O'Kane's *Rubrics*, which runs: "If the person, however, be not in a state of grace when the benediction is given, it is of no avail, and should be repeated when he recovers the state of grace." Strange to say, "Vicarius" sees great force in this quotation, inasmuch as (he argues) the author's book received the approval of the S. Congregation of

Rites as late as February 14, 1868. *Quid inde?* This approval means no more than that the book contains nothing contrary to faith or morals. The words of O'Kane, therefore, carry no weight with them in the face of the above-quoted decisions.

It is worth noting that O'Kane quotes Bouvier for his opinion on this question. But one must not shut one's eyes to the fact that Bouvier relies, as he admits himself, for this point on "a distinguished Roman theologian" writing to him in 1826. And Bouvier states further that the "opinion" of that theologian was that the state of grace was required at the time the blessing was imparted; but that he (the theologian) does not give it as *certain*. What, then, is the state of the case? O'Kane relies on Bouvier; Bouvier, in this instance, relies on a theologian of 1826, who expresses only an opinion, and does not give it as *certain*.

Again, O'Kane is clearly in opposition to the *Analecta*. I will give the words: "Quoad statum gratiae, dum hic in ceteris omnibus indulgentiis requiritur tum quum ultimum opus expletur: *e contra* in indulgentia in articulo mortis requiritur quum evenit articulus verus mortis seu quum anima a corpore separatur, quod est momentum in quo haec indulgentia lucranda est: *quare nihil confert quod aliquis expleat opera praescripta in statu peccati mortalis et multo minus quod ei applicetur indulgentia in statu peccati mortalis.* Unde intelliguntur sequentes S. I. C. resolutiones: 'Non licet iterum applicare indulgentiam in articulo mortis 1° quando aegrotus accepit applicationem in statu peccati mortalis: 2° quando post applicationem in peccatum relapsus est.'"[1] I think that "Vicarius" will grant that the term *applicatio* as used above, means the actual imparting of the blessing by the priest, and not the gaining of the benefit of the indulgence.

As regards his reference to the teaching of De Herdt, I need only remark that the opinions of authors are valueless in the light of definite decisions.

I still maintain, therefore, that the last blessing given to one in mortal sin at the time it is imparted is valid, and is *not* repeated, "quia in eodem articulo mortis infirmus indulgentiam *semel* tantum lucrari potest."

Until "Vicarius," then, can bring to light a fresh *decree*, which contradicts those already cited, or can disprove their genuineness, his contention "e contra nihil valet."

Birmingham, England. ALFRED MANNING MULLIGAN.

[1] *Cf. Analecta*, May, 1894, p. 223.

NOT INCONGRUOUS.

Qu. In supplying the ceremonies of Baptism, already validly administered *in periculo mortis*, is it not incongruous, to say the least, to use the exorcisms, especially the first—"Exi ab eo, immunde spiritus," when it is the Holy Ghost that now resides there? Yet the American Ritual, following of course the Roman, prescribes this.

SACERDOS CALIFORNIENSIS.

Resp. The ceremonies of the sacramental rites are partly efficient factors of grace, partly expressions of doctrinal precepts. In this twofold sense are they to be supplied respectively. Hence the rubrics (in the Roman Ritual) preceding the *Ordo supplendi omissa* clearly state that the form of the exorcisms and prayers is to be changed, so as to apply to the actual condition of the person already baptized by the performance of the essential sacramental act. In the case where this change of form cannot be easily made without destroying the significance of the rite, it is prescribed rather as a monition of what has taken place than as a presently efficient act. The expression, "Exi ab eo," is therefore the solemn *record* of the divine command which virtually obtained its effect when the water of Baptism touched the neophyte. Besides this, it may be rightly said that the influence of the demon upon the regenerate soul is not necessarily excluded by the dominion of the Holy Spirit, in the sense in which the title of Baptism establishes that dominion. But it is needless to insist upon this if we view the sacramental rites in their historical as well as their virtual or efficient character.

ODD SURPLICES.

To the Editor of AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

A fellow priest who recently attended the funeral of a prominent pastor, at which about one hundred and fifty of the clergy were present, was painfully struck by the absence of simplicity and propriety in the surplices worn by most of the priests.

Wapelhorst quotes Martinucci to the effect that "care should be taken that the surplice, which is now of various pattern and becomes a thing of mere ornament, should not be unbecoming in shape or of excessive elegance. It cannot be denied that the fancy work of some

surplices suggests the stage or the milliners' shops where coifs of net work and stomachers are sold,—rather than the functions of priests assembled to chant the Office of the Dead." He says that the surplice should have wide sleeves; and cites approved writers who are of opinion that it "should not be too short for ecclesiastical gravity," and that "sleeveless surplices are not rubrical."

My correspondent testifies to the clean, neat effect produced by the surplices that had neither lace nor frills of any kind, but were plain, immaculate linen. Even these, however, are often low-necked. He has no patience with surplices that not only are all lace or mere tennis netting, but are also made many-ply thick with flounces, making it appear that the wearer has on several surplices.

He quotes one old bishop as saying that these short, sleeveless, low-necked things looked like *subuculae infantium* (babies' shirts); another prelate,—he thinks it was Archbishop Bayley,—whose choler displayed itself on a similar occasion, making him exclaim: "My sakes! look at that man with a sunflower on his breast and a cauliflower on his back!"

What is accountable for all this? I fear it is the lady friends of young priests. Poor things, they mean well. But they have no model, and must draw on their own taste and fancy. As for making presents of surplices, they simply cannot be prevented from doing it; neither should they.

Is there no prescribed style, then? I think the rule that ordains absolute plainness for sacerdotal albs might furnish a guide for surplice-making too. And for my own experience, there seems to be nothing so graceful, attractive, and restful to the eye, as a perfectly plain surplice with medium sleeves and low-neck, half covering a plain black cassock, a decent collar, with a pure, white face above it, and a head crowned with a clean, regular-shaped biretta without tuft or tassel, such as the Cardinals wear.

Suppose we give our excellent, well-meaning benefactresses a hint on the subject?

Mt. St. Mary's, Maryland. EDWARD MCSWEENY.

CONCLUSION OF THE LITANY OF LORETTO.

Many of our popular prayerbooks in giving the Litany of the Blessed Virgin conclude the petitions by "Christ, hear us; Christ, graciously hear us; Lord, have mercy on us; Christ, have mercy

on us," etc., after the words "Lamb of God, who takest away the sins," etc. This is indeed prescribed in the Litany of All Saints, and in part for the Litany of the Holy Name. The addition is not, however, to be made in the liturgical use of the Litany of our Blessed Lady, called *Lauretanca*. We print to this effect the decree of the S. Congregation of Rites, December 7, 1900, among the *Analecta* of this month, p. 141.

THE OFFICE OF ST. JOHN BAPTIST DE LA SALLE.

Qu. Has the feast of St. John Baptist de La Salle, founder of the Brothers of the Christian Schools, an office and Mass? And may a pastor sing a solemn Mass in honor of the Saint on May 15, at a church where there is a large number of Christian Brothers who wish to celebrate the feast?

Resp. We publish in this issue of the *Analecta* the Decree making the celebration of the feast of St. John Baptist de La Salle obligatory next year for those who recite the canonical hours. The office and the Mass (*Os justi* de Communi Conf. non Pont. with separate Oration and Gospel) are prescribed for this purpose, and are to be inserted in the universal calendar for 1902 (May 15) as a *duplex min.* The prayer and the lessons of the second and third nocturns are proper.

THE TERM OF A NOVENA.

Qu. Should the day of the feast be counted as the ninth day of a novena, or should there be nine full days previous to the feast itself?

Resp. A novena in preparation for a feast usually opens on the evening (first vespers) of the ninth day before the feast itself, so as to conclude on the eve (first vespers) of the feast. As in these cases the ecclesiastical day is the customary standard of computing time, the novena may end on the feast day, that is, at any time before sundown of the day itself. Hence the precise time of the conclusion of the novena depends on the time of the ecclesiastical day (which comprises parts of two civil days) on which it begins, the ecclesiastical day continuing from the evening of one civil day to the evening of the next.

THE ORTHODOXY OF THE PRAYER "SACROSANCTAE."

Qu. Are not the *cultus latriae*, the *cultus hyperduliae*, and the *cultus duliae* erroneously confounded in the prayer "Sacrosanctae," recited after the Divine Office, the words "sempiterna laus, honor, virtus, et gloria"—the highest expression of worship—being applied equally to the "individuae Trinitati," the "fecundae integritati" B.M.V., and the "Sanctorum universitati?" S. C.

Resp. The words "sempiterna laus, honor, virtus, et gloria" being applied equally to the Blessed Trinity, Our Lady, and the Saints, express worship in the wider and ordinary sense. "Absit invidia verbis quae juxta eorum vim adhibemus," says Kenrick, in treating of the distinction between the *cultus latriae, hyperduliae et duliae*.[1]

The prayers of the Church mostly antedate the distinctions of the schools, which distinctions were made to combat misinterpretations, not to invite them. And just as the old proverbs, containing truths of great practical value, do not lose their force and correctness because they do not answer to the analysis of later grammatical rules, so the words of the Church or the Sacred Text retain their true meaning, despite the fact that it is possible to interpret them in a false sense by applying distinctions intended as safeguards against such misinterpretation.

TESTING THE PURITY OF WINE.

To the Editor of AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Some time ago there appeared in the REVIEW a series of articles on the subject of Altar Wines, but as far as I remember there was nothing said about testing the purity of the wine. The following is a very simple test, and one which any priest can apply, and it will thus prove useful to the purchaser of altar wines.

Take a large goblet, and fill three parts full with clear water. Then fill a small, slim bottle with the wine to be tested. Hold one finger over the mouth of the bottle to prevent the wine running out while the bottle is inverted, in which position dip the little bottle into the vessel of water. Now remove the finger, and watch the impurities of the adulterated wine descend in clouds into the water. The

[1] Tr. XII, 1, 4.

wine will lose its color and also its taste, as the water absorbs the ingredients added to the grape juice. On the other hand, if the wine is pure, no change will be noted, either in the bottle or goblet. This test holds good, except for alcohol.

The experiment was made in the presence of several priests, on a New Mexico wine, which was certified as pure, but which showed much adulteration; also on an Illinois wine, from a Catholic wine producer, which lost neither color nor taste.

A. J. G.

Columbus, O.

NUMBER OF LIGHTS ON ALTAR OF EXPOSITION.

Qu. There seem to be various decisions regarding the number of wax candles required on the altar during exposition of the Blessed Sacrament. The Clementine Instruction prescribes twenty: "ad altare *continuo ardeant* viginti *saltem* lumina, sex nempe candelae unius librae, quarum tres ab unoquoque latere crucis, et octo candelae in superiori parte, cum aliis quatuor a partibus ostensorii, in cujus parte anteriori nullum omnino ponatur lumen; adsint tandem duo candelebra cum cereis, quorum unusquisque trium saltem sit librarum." This is surely explicit. Yet I find that some have only twelve; others, ten wax candles continually burning; and they justify their action by reference to decrees cited at various times in the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

In connection with the mention in the Clementine Instruction of the number and exact weight of wax candles to be used in the liturgical functions of the Exposition, it strikes me that either our wax is poorer than that used in Italian and French churches, or else there is something in our climate that makes the candles more readily bend and melt, so as to become often an annoyance, if not a danger, during the service. Is there no provision in the decrees of the Church which might dispense from the obligation of using the wax lights?

Resp. The prescriptions of the Clementine Instruction apply literally and strictly to Rome. In a modified form they become the rule of liturgical worship outside Rome, that is, according to the circumstances and sanctioned customs of different localities. This is indicated by various decisions of the S. Congregation of Rites, and in a measure by the Instruction itself. The latter re-

quires that during the night, if the church be closed, whilst the Blessed Sacrament remains exposed, there be ten candles of wax on the altar, the remaining lights being of any other material; also that "tempore vespertino tot in ecclesia ponantur lumina, quot ad vitandam confusionem sufficiant." The latter phrase plainly implies that discretion is to be used in such matters to avoid not only confusion, but also danger. Father Lehmkuhl in commenting on this point of the Instruction says, "extra eandem (Urbem) standum est statutis et justis laudabilibusque consuetudinibus dioecesium."

As regards the quality and weight of the wax lights to be used during the public services, it is plain that there should be some means found to prevent the inconvenience complained of by our correspondent and which seems to be nearly universal in the United States. The wax candles furnished by reputable merchants, and guaranteed to be pure so far as practical manufacture appears to allow, are frequently found to bend over and to fall from their sconces whenever the atmosphere in the church is unusually warm.

As the Church has never allowed any regular substitute for the use of wax in the liturgy, owing to its symbolical significance, there are only two remedies that suggest themselves against the evil complained of. Either the makers of wax candles must adopt a departure from the old custom of long tapers, proportionately thin; or the manufacturers of candelabra must alter the style of close-set rows of candle-holders. There is no reason why we should not make use of short thick candles, unless old habits have produced the sense that this form is a violation of æsthetics befitting the altar. But that is only prejudice. The arrangement of candlesticks might be made subject to similar modification, and that with perfect propriety, if we remember not what we have been used to, but what is of use, while maintaining the liturgical law which expresses the mystic signification of the prescribed material.

A compromise lies of course in the use of artificial tubes of tin or wood in imitation of candlesticks. But many priests object to this as they object to muslin flowers, or any kind of imitation on the altar of the Real Presence.

A PATTERN FOR MAKING THE "ORDO" OF 1902.

(*Concluded.*)

Incipit pars autumnalis Breviarii.

†31 D. 15. p. Pent. 1. Sept. Raymundi Nonnati *d.* c. Dom.—*Inc. lib. Iob.*

SEPTEMBER.

1 F. 2. Aegydii *simp.* c. Duodec. Fratrum—*vel.* Vot. Angel. c. Aegidii et Duodec. Fratrum.
2 F. 3. Stephani Reg. *sem.*
3 F. 4. De ea (RR. ex 1. Noct. Dom. praec.)—*vel* Vot. Ioseph.
4 F. 5. De ea—*vel* Vot. Sacram.—*In Stat. Eccl.* Rosae a Viterbio *d.*
5 F. 6. Laurentii Iustiniani *sem.*
6 S. De B. M. in Sabb. *simp.*—*vel* Vot. Imm. Concept.
† 7 D. 16. p. Pent. 2. Sept. De ea *sem.*
† 8 F. 2. NATIVITATIS B. M. V. *d. 2. cl. cum oct.* c. Hadriani in Laud. et Miss. priv.
9 F. 3. De oct. *sem.* c. Gorgonii.
10 F. 4. Nicolai a Tolentino *d.* c. oct.
11 F. 5. De oct. *sem.* c. Proti et Hyacinthi.
12 F. 6. De oct. *sem.*
13 S. De oct. *sem.*
†14 D. 17. p. Pent. 3. Sept. Exaltat. Crucis *d. m.* c. Dom. et oct.
15 F. 2. Oct. Nativ. B. M. V. *d.* c. Nicomedis.
16 F. 3. Cornelii et Cypriani *sem.* c. Euphemiae et Soc. — *Inc. lib. Tobiae*, ex Dom. praec.
17 F. 4. QUAT. TEMP. Impressio Stigmat. Francisci *d.* c. fer.
18 F. 5. Iosephi a Cupertino *d.*
19 F. 6. QUAT. TEMP. Ianuarii et Soc. *d.* c. fer.
20 S. QUAT. TEMP. Vigil. (de qua nihil in Off.) Eustachii et Soc. *d.* c. fer. (In Miss. 3. or. Vigil).
†21 D. 18. p. Pent. 4. Sept. MATTHAEI *d. 2 cl.* c. Dom.
22 F. 2. Thomae a Villanova *d.* c. Mauritii et Soc.—*Inc. lib. Iudith*, ex Dom. praec.
23 F. 3. Lini *sem.* c. Theclae.
24 F. 4. B. M. V. de Mercede *d. m.*
25 F. 5. Nominis B. M. V. (*f. 14 hui.*) *d. m.*
26 F. 6. Cypriani et Iustinae *simp.*—*vel* Vot. Passionis, c. Cypriani et Iustinae.—*Inc. lib. Esther*, ex Dom. V. Sept.
27 S. Cosmae et Damianii *sem.*
†28 D. 19. p. Pent. 1. Oct. VII Dolorum B. M. V. *d. m.* c. Dom et Wenceslai.
29 F. 2. (Romae †) DEDIC. MICHAELIS ARCHANG. *d. 2 cl.*
30 F. 3. Hieronymi *d.*

OCTOBER.

1 F. 4. Remigii *sem. ad libit. vel simpl. de praecepto* (in Gallia *d.*)—*Inc. lib. I. Machab.* ex Dom. praec.
2 F. 5. Angel. Custod. *d. m.*
3 F. 6. De ea (RR. ex 1. Noct. Dom. praec.)—*vel* Vot. Passionis.
4 S. Francisci *d. m.*
† 5 D. 20. p. Pent. 2. Oct. ROSARII B. M. V. *d. 2. cl.* c. (*Romae* Gallae) Dom. (ac Placidi et Soc. in Laud. et Miss. priv.).
6 F. 2. Brunonis *d.*
7 F. 3. Marci *simp.* c. Sergii et Soc. —*vel* Vot. App. (*Romae.* Vot. Petri et Pauli) c. Marci ac Sergii et Soc.
8 F. 4. Birgittae *d.*
9 F. 5. Dionysii et Soc. *sem.*
10 F. 6. Francisci Borgia *sem.*
11 S. De B. M. in Sabb. *simp.*—*vel* Vot. Imm. Concept.
†12 D. 21. p. Pent. 3. Oct. De ea *sem.*

aliq. loc. Maternitatis B. M. V. *d. m.* c. Dom.

13 F. 2. Eduardi *sem.*

14 F. 3. Callisti I. *d.*

15 F. 4. Teresiae *d.*

16 F. 5. De ea—*vel* Vot. Sacram.

17 F. 6. Hedwigis *sem.*

18 S. LUCAE *d. 2. cl.*

† 19 D. 22. p. Pent. 4. Oct. Petri de Alcant. *d.* c. Dom.—*Inc. lib. II. Machab.*—*aliq. loc.* Puritatis B. M. V. *d. m.* c. Petri de Alcant. et Dom.

20 F. 2. Ioannis Cantii *d.*—*aliq. loc. Inc. lib. II. Machab.* ex Dom. praec.

21 F. 3. Hilarionis *simp.* c. Ursulae et Soc.—*vel* Vot. App. (*Romae* Vot. Petri et Pauli) c. Hilarionis ac Ursulae et Soc.

22 F. 4. De ea—*vel* Vot. Ioseph.

23 F. 5. De ea—*vel* Vot. Sacram.—*Romae.* Redemptoris *d. m.*

24 F. 6. De ea—*vel* Vot. Passionis.—*aliq. loc.* Raphaëlis Archang. *d. m.*

25 S. De B. M. in Sabb. *simp.* (*vel* Vot. Imm. Concept.) Chrysanthi et Dariae.

† 26 D. 23. p. Pent. 5. Oct. De ea *sem.* c. Evaristi.—*Igitur Eleazarus.*

27 F. 2. Vigil. De ea, ll. hom. (RR. fer. 2.)—*vel* Vot. Angel. c. Vigil.—*Mortuo itaque.*

† 28 F. 3. SIMONIS et IUDAE *d. 2. cl.*

29 F. 4. De ea—*Mortuo itaque*, ex fer. 2. praec. (RR. fer. 4.)—*vel* Vot. Ioseph.—*Antiochus autem*, ex fer. 3. praec.

30 F. 5. De ea—*Antiochus autem*, ex fer. 3. praec. (RR. fer. 5.)—*vel* Vot. Sacram. (ll. fer. 5.).

31 F. 6. Vigil. De ea, ll. hom. (RR. fer. 6.)—*vel* Vot. Passionis, c. Vigil.

NOVEMBER.

† 1 S. OMNIUM SANCTORUM, *d. 1. cl. cum. oct.*

† 2 D. 24. p. Pent. 1. Nov. 4. p. Epiph. De ea *sem.* c. oct.—*Inc. Ezechielis.*

3 F. 2. De oct. *sem.* Comm. omn. Defunct *d.*

4 F. 3. Caroli *d.* c. oct. ac Vitalis et Agricolae.

5 F. 4. De oct. *sem.*

6 F. 5. De oct. *sem.*

7 F. 6. De oct. *sem.*

8 S. Oct. omnium Ss. *d.* c. Quatuor Coronat. (Hoc anno omitt. Dom. 2. Nov.).

† 9 D. 25. p. Pent. 3. Nov. 5. p. Epiph. Dedic. Basilic. Salvatoris *d. m.* c. Dom. et Theodori.

10 F. 2. Andreae Avellini *d.* c. Triphonis et Soc.—*Inc. lib. Danielis.*

11 F. 3. Martini *d.* c. Mennae.

12 F. 4. Martini I. *sem.*

13 F. 5. Didaci *sem.*—*In Italia* Stanislai Kostka *d.*

14 F. 6. Iosaphat *d.*

15 S. Gertrudis *d.*

† 16 D. 26. p. Pent. 4. Nov. 6. p. Epiph. De ea *sem.* (*In Italia* c. Didaci, *ass. ex 13 hui.*) *Inc. lib. Osee.*

17 F. 2. Gregorii Thaum. *sem.* (Romae *d.*).

18 F. 3. Dedic. Basilic. Petri et Pauli *d. m.*

19 F. 4. Elisabeth *d.* c. Pontiani—*Inc. Ioël*, ex fer. 3. praec.

20 F. 5. Felicis de Valois *d.*—ll. 1. Noct. 1. *Inc. Amos*, 2. *Inc. Abdias*, ex fer. 6. seq. 3. *Inc. Ionas*, ex Sabb. Seq.

21 F. 6. Praesentationis B. M. V. *d. m.*

22 S. Caeciliae *d.*

† 23 D. 27. ult. p. Pent. 5. Nov. Clementis I. *d.* c. Dom. ac Felicitatis.

24 F. 2. Ioannis a Cruce *d.* c. Chrysogoni—ll. 1. Noct. 1. *Inc. Michaeas*, ex Dom. praec. 2. et 3. *Inc. Nahum.*

25 F. 3. Catharinae *d.*—*Inc. Habacuc.*